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Abstract

Roman Egypt has produced a considerable amount of documentary, papyrological material illuminating for historians the society of the chora. Some of the material illuminates the role of the army in society and much of this has not been exploited by military historians. The thesis is divided into two broad sections. The first section, chapters 3 to 7, cover the role of the army as an institution. I consider the military role of the army in guarding against external threats or launching expeditions out of Egypt and the place of the forces in Egypt in the crises in the Eastern Mediterranean. I go on to study the internal revolts in Alexandria and in the chora before concluding the section with a detailed analysis of the impact of the army at the level of the village. Here I concentrate on the policing role of the army and especially on the position of the centurion. The second part of the thesis concerns the position of the soldiery in Egyptian society, looking at their legal, social and economic position as well as recruitment and veteran settlement. Much of the evidence for this part of the thesis comes from the North-eastern Fayum villages and the section culminates in a case study of one of the villages of that area, Karanis.
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I
Preface

When the subject for this thesis was first suggested my first reaction was to reject the idea out of hand. I had never had any real interest in military history and as an undergraduate had striven to avoid writing anything that might involve much research on such matters. I came to this work with little prior knowledge of the Eastern Mediterranean or Egypt and my interest had always been in history through literature not documents or archaeology. Yet, the material had an immediate allure. The insights into a part of society impossible for the classical historian to study were fresh and exciting and the prospects of tracing the impact of a foreign culture on this level of society fascinating. This study has sprung from an interest in Egypt and I must apologise to the reader interested in the army if the military get lost in the country but I hope they will struggle through until it reappears. I have incurred many debts in the writing of this thesis both to those who have helped directly and those who have indirectly encouraged me by a kind word or sharing a thought. I would like to thank especially Dominic Rathbone who has supervised this thesis with great patience and dedication; Sara who has supported me through the pressures of the last few years and listened to my enthusiasms with unfailing patience; Kate Gilliver who
has helped me understand something of the archaeology of the period and Dominic Montserrat who has always been ready to answer my queries about Egypt and glance at the more troublesome documents. I would also like to thank Jane Rowlandson, Margaret Roxan, Averil Cameron and Tim Cornell. I must thank the teaching staff of the relevant departments of U.C.L. and King's, the staff of the Institute of Classical Studies, especially those who work in the library, and the post-graduates who have introduced to me to many new fields and ideas. It is only at this stage that I realize how much of a team effort thesis production is.
The military history of the Roman Empire has become something of a backwater in recent years. The study of this important area of Roman life has been neglected or has become the preserve of an extremely well-informed group of specialists, operating within their own parameters. These specialists tend to see the army as an institution which can be studied separately from the rest of Roman society and to some extent the study has evolved separately to the changes in ancient history over the last twenty to thirty years. The study has been dominated by the view from the western provinces and by those historians trained in the discipline of archaeology rather than ancient history. This is perhaps no bad thing but can tend to lead to assumptions and methods being unquestioned over many years. It has also led to a great division between the military historians and the ancient historians. When I mention my thesis topic to most ancient historians, a slightly glazed look appears in the eye as memories of books on the Roman imperial army started but never finished come flooding back. With military historians the reaction is often initially very different; a moment of wild enthusiasm which is soon lost at the mention of the word "society". At a recent conference, archaeology-based, military historians spent a great deal of time
congratulating each other on the work accomplished in the last years and searching for new directions, new questions that needed answering. This healthy process was marred by a lack of self-doubt or of questioning of firmly held assumptions that lay behind so much of the methodology. At a recent conference of ancient historians, the announcement of a paper on Roman military history caused dark murmurings about phone-calls to be made and book shops to be visited before the realization that there was no tactful escape. Yet talked to privately, many of the military historians and the ancient historians express similar doubts over the modern literature on the army. All historians attack the "old-fashioned ideas" that dominate much readily available work. Younger scholars, though this is perhaps the nature of younger scholars, almost universally express profound dissatisfaction with the received view. It seems that the time is fast approaching when there will be radical change within the historiography of the Roman imperial army.

This thesis will not bring about that revolution. However, I seek to break away from the traditional constraints of military history. Thus there are many traditional areas of interest which do not appear here. Strategy is considered in one chapter but only briefly. There is no consideration of the problems of supply and of logistics; no discussion of the officering of the army and
no study of senior ranks. Similarly there is no study of paths of promotion and there is virtually nothing on the internal organisation of military units. The tactics, training and equipment of the forces are ignored. The archaeology of the army, its forts, roads, limites, only have a minor role to play. My concern is to consider the army within a precise social and political context which is more fully illuminated for Egypt than for any other province.

To build up such a picture, we must start very slowly, very carefully. My first chapter is very traditional in approach. It is the foundation of the study, placing the army on the map before going on to consider its function and role. I suppose that I start as I imagine the Roman emperor starting, with a list of units, looking at them in the context of the empire as a whole. But, progressively, I move away from the imperial view towards Egypt, looking at the army on the ground, and ending in a village in the Fayum.

This may seem to be the wrong direction. To start with the general and work down to the specific might be considered perverse and work against any claims to general applicability. This brings me to the problem of Egypt. The "Egypt is different" school is undoubtedly very persuasive but not only is the difference between Egypt and the rest of
the empire a problem, but the differences within Egypt are also problematic. The papyrological finds for our period come almost exclusively from Middle Egypt and the Fayum. The desiccation of the towns and villages of these areas have preserved tens of thousands of papyri but the dampness of the Delta has destroyed nearly all the records from that area and very few papyri have been found in the perhaps more stable settlements of Upper Egypt. For these areas then we are more or less in the same situation as we are for the rest of the empire as regards information and it would be extremely dangerous to generalize from the Fayum to the rest of Egypt without taking precautionary measures. The situation in the Fayum then does not prove what the position was like in the rest of Egypt without even considering the empire as a whole. We are, however, dealing with an empire-wide institution and we are dealing with that institution often at its most basic level, the level of the individual soldier and the individual incident. Many provinces of the empire are different from other provinces and many areas within those provinces differed from other areas of the province. I do not claim that my picture of the Roman soldiery would be valid in all provinces at all times but that this kind of picture might have a more general applicability, something that my use of literary evidence at least supports. It is up to those who disagree with the picture to show otherwise.
The legionary garrison and the changes therein have been well known since the days of Lesquier and there has been little change in the picture he drew. The first reference to the legionary garrison is from Strabo and this tells us that there were three legions in Egypt under Augustus, one of which was based near Alexandria and another in Babylon. The position of the third legion is unknown. When we come across their numerals and names, two of them were the XXII Deiotariana and the III Cyrenaica. The latter legion is presumed to have been one of the legions which had been placed in Cyrenaica by Antony but which, after Actium, when Antony was in desperate need of troops, remained in Cyrenaica and thus, in effect, defected to Octavian. It seems that the title of Cyrenaica was granted to the legion in honour of this. The name Deiotariana was a reference to the King of Galatia who had created a force armed and trained after the Roman fashion. It is clear that by 23 A.D. the garrison had been reduced to two legions and it seems that these legions were based in Nikopolis, outside Alexandria.

There does not seem to have been any change in the first-century picture until after the death of Trajan. The whole of the East had been thrown into confusion by the
military effort of the expedition into Parthia and the various disturbances in the East. At some point a new legion, the II Traiana, was stationed in Egypt. This may have restored the forces in Egypt to three legions but if so, the increase in the establishment was only temporary since the III Cyrenaica was despatched to the new province of Arabia and the XXII legion disappeared probably during the Bar-Kochba revolt. From this point there was only one legion in Egypt and this was based in Nikopolis.

There is a certain amount of evidence that shows that there was another legion based in Egypt, the XV Apollinaris. However, there are only two real attestations of this legion, one literary, telling us that Titus had collected the legion from Egypt when Vespasian had been entrusted with the campaign against the Jews, and the other epigraphic, attesting the presence of a centurion at the quarry of Mons Claudianus in the Trajanic period. However, after the Jewish war had been brought to a successful conclusion, Titus, having arrived back in Egypt with his prisoners and with two legions, one of which was XV Apollinaris, sent the legions back to where they had come from and the XV was sent to Pannonia. It seems that the legion had only been stationed in Egypt temporarily, probably by Nero in preparation for a major campaign. The presence of the centurion in the Trajanic period is best dealt with
elsewhere and it is sufficient to note that the presence of one centurion does not necessarily mean that the whole legion was in the province or even that part of the legion was there.\textsuperscript{10} It is quite clear from Josephus's narrative that he regarded the garrison of Egypt as being two legions during this period.\textsuperscript{11}
In this next section, I intend to detail the numbers of the auxiliary units serving in Egypt, collecting all references to the auxiliary units and, using this, date the various movements of the units, the distribution of the military units within Egypt, and finally the numerical strength of the Roman garrison. This forms an essential preliminary to the investigation of the role and function of the army.

Auxiliary units

1. Ala Apriana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChLA XI 501</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. III 159; CPL 212</td>
<td>41-68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Property dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI VI 729 CPL 186</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Cappodocia/Egypt</td>
<td>Sale of horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU IV 1033</td>
<td>98-117</td>
<td></td>
<td>Epikrisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 69</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Soldiers' Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hamb. I 31a</td>
<td>117-138</td>
<td></td>
<td>Epikrisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB IV 7523</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL III 49 1Memnon 56</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Prefect's offering to Memnon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This unit has a good spread of attestations throughout the period and into the third century. The station of the unit in the early third century seems to have been the Oasis of Hermes in the western desert. In 120, the unit was almost certainly stationed at Koptos. BGU I 69 forms part of a series of documents dealing with a loan and the attempts of C. Iulius Agrippianus to reclaim the loan from the heir of a horseman. It seems clear that the loan was contracted at Koptos. The undated tombstone (CIL III 6026) of Sex. Mevius Sex. f. Fab. Domitius horseman and signifer of the ala from Syene informs us that this man was 24 when he died and since service was normally twenty-five or -six years, he was still serving. The unit does not appear in the diploma of 156. The references immediately before 156 concern veterans but it seems unlikely that the unit was not in Egypt at the time of the Hadrianic epikrisis, if not impossible, and similarly it seems unlikely that the unit had not returned to Egypt by 170 when the Prefect visited
the statues of Memnon at Thebes. In all probability the unit remained in Egypt and we must restore its name in the diploma of 156.

2. Ala Augusta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Hamb. III</td>
<td>Pre-50</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchus</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Hamb. I 1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Hamb. I 31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Epikrisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of documents mentioning the ala Augusta from outside Egypt:

| CIL III 600 | c163 | Unit in Mesopotamia |
| CIL VII 340 | 188 | Britain |
| CIL VII 341 | 191 | Britain |
| CIL VII 342 | 193-211 | Britain |
| CIL VII 351 | 213 | Britain |
| CIL VII 344 | 242 | Britain |
| CIL VII 353 | | Britain |
| CIL VII 338 | | Britain |
| CIL III 5819 | | Raetia |
| CIL III 4812 | 238 | Noricum |
| CIL III 4834 | | Noricum |

Tombstone of veteran of vexillation
This unit seems to have been in Egypt during the first century but later transferred out of the province. Its first appearance elsewhere was as part of the force commanded by M. Valerius Lollianus in the campaigns in Mesopotamia. There may of course be more than one ala Augusta and it seems sensible to distinguish between the ala serving in Noricum and that serving in Britain at roughly the same time.

3. Ala Commagenorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChLA XI 501</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Tait II 1689 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4587</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4575</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesquier App. I 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit remains virtually unknown. The reading of ChLA XI 501 is not certain. The name of the unit has been read from the first two letters of Commagenorum and even they seem dubious. The ala is attested in Noricum in 106
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(CIL XVI 52) and in 135/138 (RMD 93. cf CIL III 5224). However, the reference of 165 does seem certain.

4. Ala Veterana Gallica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Dedication by the Praefectus Gallorum et Ber[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Lond. II p. 42 482; CPL 114; Fink 80; ChLA III 203</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hay receipt from procurator faenaris Serenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Wisc. I 14 131</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal case where eques of ala represents soldier of II Thracum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. VII 140</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438; CPL 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Gren. II 143</td>
<td>Soknopaiou Nesos</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Fouad I 153</td>
<td>Nikopolis</td>
<td>Soldiers'loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 CPL 185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. VI 154</td>
<td>Bakchias/Karanis</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 157-161</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Gen. I 161</td>
<td>Camels purchased by decurion of ala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Daris 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hamb. I 179</td>
<td>Hay receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Fink 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer (1990) 179</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Gren. II 191</td>
<td>Soknopaiou Nesos</td>
<td>Grain receipt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 159</td>
<td>Nikopolis</td>
<td>List of decurions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Alex+Giss 201-2</td>
<td>Soknopaiou Nesos</td>
<td>Request for entertainers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB X 10519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ala veterana Gallica is by contrast to the previous ala extraordinarily well attested. The first attestation of the unit in Egypt has been dated to the late first century on the style of the script and the mention of the prefect of Mons Berenices by Bernand. This creates a minor problem as the unit is not attested on the diploma of
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105 (RMD 9) which would suggest that the unit had not arrived in Egypt at that time. The unit was clearly in Egypt by 130 and the last attestation of the unit in Syria was in 91. This seems to have encouraged Bernard into giving the inscription a later date. It seems possible, however, that the inscription is either second century or that the inscription is early first century and refers to a different unit. A very early diploma, the diploma of A.D. 54, also suggests that the titles of auxiliary units were not at this time fixed into the pattern we know from the later auxiliary diplomas. 15

The first place the unit can be associated with is Syene in 131 but this is an isolated reference and the majority of the other references to the unit come from Delta or Fayum. P.Wisc. I 14 records a legal dispute between soldiers over a will. One of the interested parties, Aemelius of Cohors II Thracum, was unable to attend. He was represented by Iulius Apollinarius custos armorum of the ala veterana Gallica.

The arrival of the unit at Alexandria, if it ever was in fact stationed at Syene, seems likely to have occurred before 143. However, P.Gren. II 51 is not certain to have involved a soldier of that unit. Its identification rests upon the striking similarity of the document to P.Fouad I 45
of 153 which involves a man whose name could be read as Heronianus, eques of the ala veterana Gallica, although the first letter is dubious, whereas the earlier document involves Antonius Heronianus, eques. The identification seems relatively likely and so we can probably place the unit in Lower Egypt by the 140s.

The next document of interest is the famous series of hay receipts from 179 preserved amongst the documents of Iulius Serenus the curator of the ala.16 This document details the departures from the camp over a three month period at the beginning of 179. For the moment it will suffice to say that of the twelve sites to which soldiers are dispatched during this period several are identifiable as being in the area just to the South of the Delta but some were sent to Klysma, at the very Northern end of the Red Sea and some to Taposiris, on the Mediterranean coast to the West of Alexandria. The camp from which the soldiers were dispatched is unknown. In 199 the unit is encamped at Alexandria with the ala I Thracum Mauretania. This gives us a list of decurions for the ala for that year. This information has enabled the editor of P.Alex.+Giss. 3 = SB X 10619 to identify the decurion in that document with Antonius Antiochianus of the ala veterana Gallica. The decurion is not however necessarily the same man since the editor could only read two of the letters of "Antiochianus"
from which the identification was made. The document itself is very interesting since it appears to be a request for flute players and dancing girls in order to celebrate festivities connected with the imperial household and Egyptian deities. Although the letter may be an indirect request for money to pay for the hire of these entertainers it looks more as if the priests at Soknopaiou Nesos were asking permission to stage such festivities.17

The various attestations in the early third century tell us that the unit remained in Egypt but little more. This is confirmed by the Notitia Dignitatum placing the unit at Rhinocolura, which was on the very Eastern edge of Egypt on the Mediterranean coast (Not. Dig. Or. xxviii 28).

5. Ala Heraciana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Amh. 107</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Hermopolite</td>
<td>Grain receipt. Ala at Koptos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPL 190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Rvl. II 85</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grain receipt. Ala at Koptos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU II 807</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Madmola</td>
<td>Grain receipt. Ala at Koptos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Amh. 109</td>
<td>185-6</td>
<td>Hermopolite</td>
<td>Receipt for payment for supplies from village elders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Amh. 108</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Hermopolite</td>
<td>Grain receipt. Ala at Koptos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.O. 961</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This ala is very well-attested for a very short period of time in the mid second century. It is clearly associated with one station, Koptos. The level of attestation is largely due to the survival of a group of documents relating to the activities of Iulius Iustinus (Vestinus in BGU II 807, but Iustinus in the Rylands and Amherst papyri). Iustinus seems to have been in charge of supplying the ala. The ostraka from the Thebaid also come from the late second century and allow us to place the unit in the Thebaid up to the early third century. These second-century references do not give the unit any numeral and so we cannot be sure that the unit was still in Egypt at the end of the third century. This lack of information on the nomenclature must also leave open a possible identification with the ala Thracum.
Herculiana attested in Syria in 157 (CIL XVI 106). The unit does not appear on the diploma of 156-161 nor on the diploma of 179. This would suggest that the unit did not arrive in Egypt until the early 180s.

6. Ala I Thracum Mauretanıa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Judaea</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU II 696</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Contrapollonis-polis Magna</td>
<td>Officer served with ala but returns to his own cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 26</td>
<td>173/4</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Census return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU II 447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 6581</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Nikopolis</td>
<td>List of decurions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 221</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Nikopolis</td>
<td>Military will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 75</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. inv. 256</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Hermopolite</td>
<td>Loan to priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 13578</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Kantara</td>
<td>Rebuilding of camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Coll. Youtie 1 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 14139</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Tombstone of veteran decurion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first reference to this ala is from 156 and this is of relevance to the diploma of 156-161. The non-appearance of the ala in this diploma leaves three possibilities. The first is that the diploma does not list the entire of the auxiliary forces under the command of the prefect. The
wording of the diploma itself seems to preclude this option since it claims to list the cohorts and alae under the command of the prefect. A second possible option is that the ala arrived only in 156 after the diploma had been given or that the ala had not officially been transferred to the command of the prefect. Thirdly, and this seems to me to be most likely, the unit should be read in one of the gaps in the diploma. This presents something of a problem since two alae are certain in the diploma, Vocontiorum and veterana Gallica, and there seems to be space for another two of which one must be the ala Apriana. With one available space left, the original editor suggested the inclusion of the ala Herculiana, whilst the more recent reading has been ala Mauretana.\textsuperscript{19} Consideration of the Heracliana above means that it must be more likely that the ala Thracum Mauretana rather than the Heracliana is the ala lost in the lacuna.

The unit seems to have been based at Alexandria, probably in the camp just outside the city at Nikopolis. CPL 221 is from the winter quarters of the second legion at Alexandria and CIL III 6581 associates this ala with the veterana Gallica in the camp at Alexandria. The early third-century appearance of the ala in Upper Egypt was as a result of a campaign against the Nubians under Aquila, Prefect of Egypt. The inscription is a dedication following the successful outcome of that campaign.
The most remarkable document of this ala is P. Coll. Youtie I 53. The script suggests a second-century date. The letter gives details of troop movements prior to the sending of a detachment from the Egyptian forces to Mauretania. The soldier involved has written to his mother as she had had to appear in court. He wished her to write to him about the outcome of the dispute and he wished her to write soon or else he would be out of reach in Mauretania. To encourage her rapid reply he details the planned manoeuvres. This seems to involve the movement of the cohort he is in to Alexandria prior to being shipped abroad. The African cohort was either replacing them in their current station or was being amalgamated with them in order to strengthen the unit. The Moorish ala was going to join them at some point. The soldier seems to envisage his return to Egypt within three years. It seems likely that this action was in response to some kind of an emergency which might suggest a date of 145-152. The document, however, promises far more than it delivers in the way of information as we do not know the date with any precision or even the unit of the writer. It does, however, point to service in Mauretania for this ala which really is the only one which could have been designated Moorish. If the ala did leave Egypt in the mid-second century, then there must be a possibility that the unit was still out of Egypt in 156 and that the officer
returning from the ala to the Thebaid was returning from Mauretania.

The unit was probably serving in Egypt by the mid-second century and some part, if not all the unit was transferred out to deal with troubles in Mauretania some time shortly afterwards. The unit was probably back in Egypt by 156 and stationed at Alexandria. 21

7. Ala Vocontiorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich. III</td>
<td>41-68</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Disputed military will judged by decurion of ala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159; CPL 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Wisc. II 53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Receipt for down-payment on house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Hamb. I 2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Loan of money to civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4383</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Mons Porphyrites</td>
<td>Dedication to Trajan and Isis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1906 No.22</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Discharge certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGRR 1200</td>
<td>122/3</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Dedication to Memnon by prefect Servius Sulpicius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 114</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Marriage cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Chr.II 372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB XVI 12508</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Arsinoite, Hera Klides district</td>
<td>Certificate of exemption from epikephalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 5218</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Theadelphia</td>
<td>Private letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4280</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 4</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU XV 2458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA IV 264</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchus</td>
<td>Tax receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 12068</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ptolemais Hormou</td>
<td>Inscription for decurion Q. Caesius Valens (cf. CIL III 12067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE. 1911 No. 121</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hammamat</td>
<td>Dedication to the emperor at the end of term of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Koptos 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS 628</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dmeir, Arabia</td>
<td>Strator of Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 8805</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arnheim, Germany</td>
<td>Part of the British army on special duty in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 8865</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Veteran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 1080</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newstead</td>
<td>Decurion of ala Aug. Vocont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 4030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgica</td>
<td>Prefect of ala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 3463</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgica</td>
<td>Tombstone of eques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 1835</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>Tombstone of decurion's daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 8671</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Tombstone of missicius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ala Vocontiorum is one of the best attested alae from Egypt. The unit is also one of the earliest attested of the military units in Egypt. Prior to 60 the unit is attested twice or three times but then does not appear again.
until 105. After this it is again well attested until 179 after which the unit disappears. A major alteration in the pattern of the auxiliaries would be expected in the early period with the campaigns of Corbulo, the Jewish war and the Flavian march on Rome. The temptation must be to place the inscriptive evidence from Northern Europe into this period between 59 and 105. The unit seems to have served on the German frontier and in Belgica, areas presumably severely disrupted by the rebellion of the Batavians. This seems plausible and quite neat since it would allow the return to Egypt as part of the preparation for the campaigns of Trajan, if a bit early. However, the superficial neatness of the hypothesis ought to give way to the problems of dating the European inscriptions. It might seem better to place them after the unit left Egypt or perhaps not to tie them so closely to the Egyptian unit. The presence of an ala Augusta Vocontiorum in Britain might suggest the existence of at least two alae with that tribal origin.

An inscription from Koptos (AE 1911) shows that the unit when in Egypt still had members recruited from Southern Gaul. The horseman who celebrated his release from the station he had guarded for the previous five months with an inscription was Dida son of Damana and was a Volquian. The Volqui came from the same area of Gaul as Voconti. The inscription is unfortunately undated.
The initial station of the unit may well have been Koptos since the first firmly dated document emanates from there. This is a record of the part payment of 240 drachmas on a house worth 500 drachmas. In 59 the eques lending money to civilians was at Babylon, considerably further North. The unit may well have returned to Koptos in the second-century as it is attested in the area in 116, 134, and 165. In 177, it was evidently not at Pelusium since a veteran wrote to a centurion asking his help in regaining goods that he had deposited with Petesouchos, a fellow-soldier. Petesouchos had joined the ala and left Pelusium taking with him the goods deposited.

8. Ala Xoitana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. III</td>
<td>41-68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159; CPL 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ala is known from just the one reference to a decurion of the ala sitting in judgement on a case of a disputed inheritance involving soldiers of the alae Apriana and Vocontiorum. This decurion was called in to make a third on the panel of judges. It seems likely then that the unit was serving in Egypt at this time and that the decurion was not summoned from service elsewhere. The unit is completely unknown otherwise. The name of the unit presents something of a problem being so unusual. There is a town of Xois, from
which the form Xoitana could have been derived, to the South of Lake Mareotis and to the East of Alexandria in the Delta. This would mean that the ala was of Egyptian origin but for some reason the unit failed to reach the later period in a recognisable form. This is the only ala raised in Egypt although there were two cohorts, the I and II Thebaeorum.

8. Ala Paullini

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB XVI 12609</td>
<td>A.D. 27</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>loan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is another unit known only from the one reference. The document mentions another unit known only from this document, the cohort of Ae[lius] Habetus. These two units form part of the group of auxiliary units named after their commanders by a process similar to that by which the centuries and turmae were named after their commanding officers. All these units are to be placed comparatively early in the development of the auxiliary forces. It may also be that the ala Xoitana was named after a commander or possibly its station. It is difficult to find any of these units in the post 69 period. The horseman involved in this document is a L. Caecilius Secundus. The document is in Latin and has a consular dating. The month is also Latin and not Egyptian. There is a Greek subscript dated by the Emperor. The soldier he was dealing with also had a Roman name, C. Pompeius. This is in itself surprising since it
looks on the surface as if the contract was between two Roman citizens serving in the auxiliary forces. The equation of Roman nomenclature with the Roman citizenship is however unsure.

This completes the survey of the Egyptian evidence for alae. We must now turn to a consideration of the cohorts.
There is some doubt about the numeral of this unit. The inscription from Bithynia clearly mentions the I Ulpia as does the diploma of 179, but the other non-reconstructed numeral is the certificate of examination of 159 which points to II Ulpia. The 179 diploma seems to be preferable since the examination certificate identifies the unit as II Ulpia not II Ulpia Afrorum. The private letter has been discussed above with reference to the ala Thracum Mauretan·a. The proposed date for the document of 145-152 is not incompatible with the spread of dates of the unit's attestations. There is no real evidence to suggest the station of the unit.

### 11. I Apamenorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGU III 729</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Iulius Apollinarius archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lond. II p.207 177</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Iulius Apollinarius archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU III 888</td>
<td>159/60</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Iulius Apollinarius archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 600</td>
<td>c163</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vexillation in Mesopotamia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU II 423</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Letter sent via librarius of unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sel.Pap.II 112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU II 462</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Iulius Apollinarius archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich. VII</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soldiers associated with Legio II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446; CPL 226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 310</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Kasr el Banat</td>
<td>Ostrakōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Panop. Beatty I</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td>Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich. IX</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Veteran buys house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. XII</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Account with legionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV 171</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>Prefect C.Nasenius Marcellus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The documents from this unit are quite numerous but not very informative. A lot of the documents are undated. The unit does appear in the Notitia Dignitatum (Or. xxxi 60) stationed in the Thebaid and is clearly attested in the third century. The first clearly dated documents come from the small archive of documents relating to C.Iulius Apollinarius which deal with his marital problems and his land holdings in Karanis. There is little evidence that
would allow us to establish a station for the unit. The Philadelphia papyrus might suggest that the unit was based there since the letter was sent from Misenum through the librarius of the unit. It may be that the sailor's father was serving with the unit. The only other evidence is the association of the unit in several documents with soldiers of the legion. This might suggest that the unit was stationed with the legion in Alexandria. Yet, the evidence is not strong enough to draw any conclusions. The document detailing the various units which fought under M. Valerius Lollianus in Mesopotamia states that the unit is made up of archers and has a mounted element. However, none of the references from Egypt suggest this.

12. I Augusta Praetoria Lusitanorum equitata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 13582</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 3919</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Nubia</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4608</td>
<td>98-117</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI IX 1063</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruits' receipts for expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fink 74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU II 696</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Contrapollonopolis Magna</td>
<td>Pridianum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fink 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB IV 9227</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>epikrisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB IV 9228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This cohort is clearly not the same unit as served in Moesia. The unit seems to have arrived in Egypt from Judaea prior to 105 and then to have stayed through the second and third centuries. The unit is well-attested during the second century with many references from Upper Egypt and it therefore seems likely that the unit was based there.
throughout the period. There are three explicit associations with the area. BGU II 696 of 156 is by far the most important document. It is a report of the daily strength of the unit. Not only does it give the unit its full name but also tells us that the unit has been in the camp at Contrapollonospolis Magna since 131. It is also the one piece of evidence that the cohort is equitata. The strength of the unit is given as 505 soldiers, 145 horsemen and 18 camel-riders. In 160, the unit appears to have been engaged in guard duties at Syene. The soldier who was examined had served with the cohort and as part of the guard at Syene and wished to retire there. The final explicit piece of evidence is the inscription from 288 which celebrates the rebuilding of the camp of the unit, very slightly North of Contrapollonospolis Magna, at Hierakopolis. The number of dedications from Talmis also encourage the belief that the unit was stationed in the area under Trajan.

13. I Flavia Cilicia equitata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8587</td>
<td>81-96</td>
<td>Hammamat</td>
<td>Dedication to Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8324</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Mons Claudianus</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR I 18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Prefect as judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 14147&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>117-133</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Honorific inscription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This unit is again comparatively well attested. The first attestation is from 83 and the name of the unit might suggest that it had been formed not long before. It is then attested through to the third century, although the third-century reference is to a former prefect of the unit and not therefore good evidence of the unit's presence in Egypt at this time. The station of the unit presents more of a problem. The first references from Mons Claudianus and from the Wadi Hammamat strongly suggest that the unit was
stationed in that area as does AE (1956) No.54. The lack of a cognomen for the dead horseman might also suggest that the inscription was of an early date. However, the unit is clearly associated with the Southern border in the various honorific inscriptions from Syene and in CIL III 6025 recording the erection of a basilica by this unit at Syene. SB V 8911 of 158 suggests that that the unit was active building a dais in the market place in Alexandria. Just four years later the unit again appears to have been in Syene. To add to the problems, the unit is mentioned in accounts, possibly with the second and third legions. This dates the document to the second decade of the second century since only then were these two legions both together in Egypt. It is also difficult to envisage why these accounts which were possibly of inheritances were kept for these units unless they were in the same camp. This would encourage us to station the unit in Alexandria. We must assume therefore that the unit was divided between two or more camps with troops serving in Syene, Alexandria and perhaps elsewhere.

Various of the inscriptions suggest that this unit was commanded by centurions from the legion rather than by an equestrian prefect. In all three inscriptions from Syene and in the Elephantine inscription the unit is under the command of a legionary centurion. This seems to have been the standard practice in the garrison at Syene which normally
Military Establishment

consisted of three cohorts of which only one would be commanded by a prefect whilst the others were commanded by centurions. 23

14. I Hispanorum equitata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Dedication by prefect to Memnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Memnon 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8515</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 14147 2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Honorific inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Lond. 2851</td>
<td>c104</td>
<td>Stobii, Macedonia</td>
<td>Pridianum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fink 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA III 219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma. Unit sent to serve in Judaea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8518</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4124</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4126</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 4591</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside Egypt

Because of the large number of references to units of this name, I have grouped the references by region rather than by date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 163</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 35</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Dacia Porelensis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 47</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Dacia Porelensis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 64;66;68;115</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Dacia Porolissensis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 185</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Dacia Porolissensis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 6450</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pannonia Inferior</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 14430</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moesia Inferior</td>
<td>Unit called Gordiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 43</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 48</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 51</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 69</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 70</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 93</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 372</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport, Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 371</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Commander of unit a centurion of X Fretensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 373</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Commanded by African prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 374</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 377</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 378</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 379</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 380</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 1232</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryport</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 1146</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ardoch, Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 853</td>
<td>c140</td>
<td>Provincia Proconsularis</td>
<td>Retired centurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 9360</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mauretania Caesarensis</td>
<td>Retired prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 1769</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 2226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL V 7425</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 7769</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Dedication by prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 4030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgica</td>
<td>Prefect of cohort and ala Vocontiorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIII 11982</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germania</td>
<td>Tombstone of veteran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit has an unusually clear date of departure from Egypt. It had arrived in the province by 83 and had left prior to 105. In the diploma of that date the unit is still under the command of the Prefect of Egypt and is therefore still listed but it was, in fact, serving in Judaea and was never to return to Egypt. A unit of the same name was serving in Britain in the second century but it is attested as being in Britain at the same time as our unit was still in Egypt. This British unit must similarly be differentiated from the unit serving in the Danubian provinces at the same time. The evidence overwhelmingly suggests that this Danubian unit was the Egyptian unit transferred. This is confirmed by the pridianum from Stobii of the Cohort I Hispanorum veterana equitata which must have somehow found its way back to Egypt, probably with a returning veteran, in order to be preserved. The unit served with I Ituraeorum equitata and I Thebaeorum equitata at Syene in 99. There is no other evidence of a station and the
various inscriptions from Talmis would confirm an Upper Egypt posting.

15. II Ituraeorum equitata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 141471</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Inscription put up by Ituraeorum cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8336 I. Memnon 5</td>
<td>75/6</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Dedication for Memnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 141472</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Honorific inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Memnon 63</td>
<td>I?</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Memnon dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA XI 500</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions unit with III legion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XXXI(1981) 1532</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Philae</td>
<td>Dedication to Isis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 7912</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Pselchis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4601</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4616</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4603</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8521</td>
<td>146/7</td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB IV 7362</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Epikrisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA IV 264</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Oxyrhynchus</td>
<td>Tax receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XI 3101</td>
<td>Post 218</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Prefect who served in Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU XI 2024</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Thebaid</td>
<td>Requisition of supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8537</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierasykaminos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 14147</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pselchis</td>
<td>Tombstone of decurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4570</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8671</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philae</td>
<td>Dedication of unit based at Syene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit is attested throughout the period first appearing in 75, if not 28, and it is attested in the Notitia Dignitatum (Or.xxviii 44). The doubt over the first reference is caused by the lack of a numeral in the inscription. This same problem throws doubt on the identification of the unit in SB V 8671 from Philae since the numeral of the unit would have interfered with the metre. The III Ituraeorum was also based in Egypt and so confusion is possible. It is clear that this unit was based in Upper Egypt. Only two of the references come from North of the Thebaid. One is the epikrisis of a veteran who wished to live in the Arsinoite and the other is ChLA IV 264 which gives various totals for the money collected in customs duties by various units. References from 28, 99 and the poem from Philae make it clear that the unit was one of those stationed at Syene.
### 16. III Ituraeorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich. IX</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Legal document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. VII</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>List of recruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1952 No.249</td>
<td>138-61</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Mich. III</td>
<td>242-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>List of promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164; CPL 143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fink 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA X 445</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragment attesting I Pannoniorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 1020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 1021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 12069</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ptolemais</td>
<td>Greetings for the next garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hormou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL IX 1619</td>
<td>117-138</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 2394</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td>Former prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 2395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit appears to have been in Egypt throughout the period, although it does not appear in the Notitia Dignitatum. The appearance of the unit in the diploma of 156-161 depends upon an emendation of the document. The
first editor reconstructed "IIIETV[" to read III and V [Ituraeorum when the more natural reading must surely be "III Etu[raeorum". Given the length of time that the unit spent in Egypt, it is very poorly attested. It is unclear where the unit was stationed. The third-century list of promotions is on a papyrus clearly coming from the II Traiana's record office but although this might suggest that the unit was based at Alexandria as well such a connection would be highly speculative. Some members of the unit were for a time based at Ptolemais Hormou where they very kindly left the soldiers from the cohors scutata civium Romanum an inscription wishing them luck upon taking over the station. The two dedications from Talmis might suggest that the unit had been based in Upper Egypt yet both inscriptions involve the same soldier, C.Iulius Aminnaius of the century of Iulius, which might suggest a more personal expedition to the temple than other attestations of units there. The legal document from Karanis of 90 does not throw any light on the matter since it is the record of a soldier's attempt to straighten out some business of his mother's and the soldier, M.Anthestius Gemellus, clearly had family ties to the area.24
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17. I Pannoniorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA X 445</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragment mentions III Ituraeorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside Egypt

| CIL XVI 53 | 107   | Mauretania Caesarensis | Diploma                                        |
| Smallwood Documents of Trajan and Hadrian 246 | 98-117 | Ephesus | Former prefect |

| CIL VIII 20144 c160 | Oran | Former prefect |
| CIL V 885          | Aquilea | Tombstone of soldier |
| CIL XIII 7510      | Germania Superior | Tombstone of soldier |
| CIL XIII 7511      | Germania Superior | Tombstone of soldier |
| CIL XIII 7582      | Germania Superior | Tombstone of soldier |

Like the last unit, this cohort remains mysterious. It is mentioned in all four diplomas but does not appear in the Notitia Dignitatum. In the face of this ignorance, it must be assumed that the attestations from outside Egypt refer to different units.
18. Scutata civium Romanorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGU III 741</td>
<td>143/4</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 6610</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Tombstone of soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 12069</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ptolemais Hormou</td>
<td>Greetings left by III Ituraeorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1905 No.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefect of unit at Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XI 3801</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Veii</td>
<td>Former prefect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a citizen unit, this cohort never appears on the diplomas which leads to problems in dating the arrival of the unit. The first dated inscription comes from 143/4 but it is likely that the unit was based in Egypt during the first century since CIL XI 3801 details the career of a former prefect, telling us that he had been *primus pilus* of the XXII legion and had followed that up by being military tribune for both the XXII and the III legions. As both these legions were based in Egypt in the first century, it must be a fairly safe conclusion that this officer spent his entire military career in the same province. The appearance of the unit in the first century might allow us to connect it with the emergency measures taken by Augustus following the Pannonian revolt and the disasters in Germany to strengthen the army by recruiting freedmen into cohorts. CIL III 12069 shows that the unit served at Ptolemais Hormou. The evidence points to a sphere of activity in the region of the
Delta. The unit appears in the *Notitia Dignitatum* stationed at Mutheos (Or.xxxi 59) which appears to have been in the Thebaid.

19. I Thebaeorum equitata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 141472</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Honorific inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 6627</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Building inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 6627</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Building inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 114</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriage case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 1018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 1019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8524</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4614</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8523</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8525</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8541</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4561</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit is attested in Egypt for the first century and disappears after that date. The date of the raising of the unit is difficult to establish. It is not known to have served elsewhere. Probably the earliest attestation is in fact undated. This is the Koptos building inscription which
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records the construction and renovation of the forts of the Eastern desert. Interpretation of the document is difficult and discussion has centred upon the date of the document. As there appear to be two legions attested in the document, the document cannot be second century and the evidence probably suggests a dating towards the middle of the first century. The unit appears to have been stationed in Upper Egypt and was in 99 part of the garrison at Syene. The number of dedications from Talmis also suggest this. In 105, the unit was in Judaea. It seems unlikely that the unit ever returned to Egypt, since the legal case of 115 involved a veteran.

20. II Thebaeorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 37</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Dedication to Memnon by prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Memnon 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU VII 1690</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU VII 1574</td>
<td>176/7</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Official letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit is little known. There is some doubt over the unit in the 156-161 diploma, as the numeral is not preserved, but the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the inclusion of this unit. The station of the unit appears
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to have been Philadelphia, where a soldier was in 131 and where a veteran appears in 176/7.

21. I Thracum equitata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Mil. Vogl. I 25</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Tebtunis</td>
<td>Former prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL 159</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Contrapollonopolis Magna</td>
<td>Birth certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4552</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4553</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4607</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Judaea</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 600</td>
<td>c163</td>
<td>Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Unit serving in vexillation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1951 No. 254</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ismir</td>
<td>Dedication to Isis and Serapis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGRR III 1015; UGIS 586; CIG 4356</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Inscription honouring prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 4316</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pannonia Superior</td>
<td>Unit attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 15138</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pannonia Inferior</td>
<td>Tombstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 273</td>
<td></td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VII 274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 7803</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Tombstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 8318</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Tombstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 8099</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Tombstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VIII 8319</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Tombstone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This unit has only a very few references to connect it with Egypt. Two date to 127. The unit was evidently stationed at the camp at Contrapollonospolis Magna which was taken over in 132 by I Augusta Praetoria Lusitanorum. This gives a possible date for departure from Egypt. IGRR 1015 stresses connections with Egypt by mentioning in the honorific inscription Ti. Iulius Alexander, prefect of the Jewish army, and Syrios, the prefect of the legion in Egypt.

22. II Thracum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Tur. 18</td>
<td>84-96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD 9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Wisc. I 14</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Syene</td>
<td>Legal case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB X 10530</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 927</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römer(1990)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO 1015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4593</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMD 79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Germania</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 158</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Germania Inferior</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Judaea</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This unit does not appear in the 156-161 diploma but must surely be one of the units that has disappeared into the various lacunae in the document. Nor does the unit appear in the diploma of 83. The unit, therefore, probably arrived in Egypt sometime between 84 and 96. The unit does appear in the Notitia Dignitatum (Or.xxviii 45). It seems likely to have stayed in Egypt throughout the period. Therefore, it must be differentiated from the various II Thracum units attested elsewhere in the Empire. There is an accumulation of references from the Thebaid which would suggest that the unit was stationed there. SR X 10530 of 143 concerns the property of a soldier of the unit who was also a quarry-man, suggesting that the unit was engaged in the exploitation of the quarries of the Eastern desert. This would suggest a station somewhere around Koptos. P.Wisc. I 14 is more explicit since it is another legal agreement following the death of a soldier in camp at Syene.

### 23. VII Ituraeorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL III 59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Memnon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XVI 184</td>
<td>156-61</td>
<td>Karanis</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This unit can not be firmly placed in Egypt. There are only these two possible references to the unit and the diploma reference is almost certainly a misreading (See III Ituraeorum above). There are no attestations for Ituraean units above the number three, if we ignore the dubious readings of the diploma. However, the Theban reference remains. Bernand has produced a photograph of the inscription together with his transcription. The photograph appears to me to be clear on the numeral of the unit which can hardly be read any other way. The name of the prefect does present us with a possible solution. He appears to be called C. Cornelius Lucrpetianus. This should probably be read as Lucretianus which leaves a "p", possibly a \( \rho \), to be explained. This mistake suggests that the inscriber was careless which looks to be the most economical explanation for this phantom unit.

24. Nigri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8580</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hammamat</td>
<td>Dedication to Ammon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.Tait I:</td>
<td>15-36</td>
<td>Apollonis Hydreuma</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrie 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the dedication to Ammon the unit is known simply as the speiras Nigrou but in the ostrakon the cohort is Nigri Camerensiana. Both references are from the reign of Tiberius. The unit is probably named after the commander.
following the pattern known from centuries named after their centurion and, like the centuries, the cohorts are identified by the name of the commander in the genitive case.\textsuperscript{27} These units, it is assumed, were named after their commanders. The "Camerensiana" probably refers to Camerinum, suggesting that the unit was raised from there. There is a remarkable contrast between the names of the soldiers involved in these documents. In A.D. 19, the soldier who was assisting the man in charge of the mines Mammogais of Bataios whilst the soldier issuing the grain receipt was C.Iulius Longinus. Both references come from the same area and the association of the soldier with the chief of the mines also backs this association with the forts to the East of Koptos.

25. Facundi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB V 7959</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pselchis</td>
<td>Dedication to Hermes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attestation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This cohort was named after its commander and might have been stationed on the Southern border of Egypt.

26. M.Flori (Frori)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB I 4401</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hammamat</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This appears to be a dedication of L. Caecilius of this cohort. The existence of the praenomen strengthens the case that these units were named after their commanders.

27. Aelii Habeti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB XVI 12069</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Loan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document very valuably gives us the name of two early units in Egypt, the ala Paullini and this cohort.

28. II Hispanorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 114</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Koptos</td>
<td>Marriage dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Hamb. I 103</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS 8867</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chances are that this unit was never in Egypt since apart from this reference to a prefect of the unit appearing as judge in a legal dispute, the unit does not appear elsewhere. The other evidence that might suggest a connection is the inscription from Bithynia which records the career of a former prefect who had been prefect of I Ulpia Afrorum in Alexandria and then went on to command the II Hispanorum pia Flavia. The Hamburg papyrus refers to a horseman of the cohort or ala pia Flavia. This connection is nowhere near strong enough to place the unit in Egypt.
29. Ma..an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB V 8529</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talmis</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This dedication defies analysis.

30. I Nom[

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Mich. VII</td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentioned in military record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455; CPR</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit is possibly to be identified with the I Numidiarum active in Syria during the first century. 28

31. Equitum Singularium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Oxy. VII</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Oxy. XX</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eques renting land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Freib. IV</td>
<td>II/III Theadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP XXII 92</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Soknopaiou Nesos</td>
<td>Receipt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ross. Georg.</td>
<td>III 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions singulares and legionaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPP XXII 92 is dependent upon a reading of P. Freib. IV 66 and is published with it. The first reference to a horseman of this type comes in a letter sent by the Prefect to his brother who was at the time commanding the unit at Oxyrhynchus. It must be doubted whether the unit was
formally constituted as such and whether this was just a specific name given to a soldier attached to the Prefect's office as a guard. The documents dated to the early third century mentioning an officer of the unit suggest that there was a formal organisation by this time.\textsuperscript{29}

32. I Damascenorum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. III 477</td>
<td>132/3</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 73</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGU I 136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Arsinoite</td>
<td>Prefect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This unit is only attested through the prefect. It suggests that the prefect and not the unit was in Egypt.

To conclude this section, three tables follow. The first two summarise the information collected above for the alae and cohorts separately and the third table presents the material in a friendlier form. The division into periods in the third table is almost entirely due to the availability of evidence and diplomas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>First Date</th>
<th>Last Date</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Other Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apriana</td>
<td>41-68</td>
<td>268-70</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Hippones 48, 77, 120, 153, 170, 179/80, 213.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Augusta</td>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57, 57, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commagenorum</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. vet. Gallica</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>242, 244</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhinocolura 131, 140, 143, 153, 154, 154, 157-61, 161, 179, 191, 199, 201, 201-2, c225.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Heracliana</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185, 185-86, 186, 188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thracum Mauretania</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173-74, 199, 203, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vocontiorum</td>
<td>41-68</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>55, 59, 116, 122, 122/3, 134, 149, 156, 165, 177.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Xoitana</td>
<td>41-68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Paullini</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>First Date</th>
<th>Last Date</th>
<th>Diplomata</th>
<th>Notitia Dignitatum</th>
<th>Other Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Ulpia Afrorum eq.</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I Apamenor</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Silili 151,159/60, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I Flavia Cilicia eq.</td>
<td>81-96</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>118,124, 117-38,140, 156,158, 161,162, 166,217/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I Hisp. eq.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>85,99,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. II Itur. eq.</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Aiy 75/6,99, 135,136, 144,146/7, 188,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. III Itur.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>242-244</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>90,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I Pannon.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Scutata I Civ Romanorum</td>
<td>143/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutheos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I Theb. eq.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. II Theb.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>92,131, 176/7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I Thracum eq.</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. II Thracum</td>
<td>84-96</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Muson 131,143, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Nigri</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Facundii</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Frori</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Aelii Habeti</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>1-82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84-104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Apriana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Augusta</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commagenorum</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. vet. Gallica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Heracliana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thrac. Mauret.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vocontiorum</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Xoitana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Paullini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ulpia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrorum eq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I Apamenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I Aug. Pr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusitanorum eq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I Flavia</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilicia eq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I Hisp. eq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. II Itur. eq.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. III Itur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I Pannon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Scutata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ. Romanorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I Theb. eq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. II Theb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I Thracum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. II Thracum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Nigri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Facundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Frori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Aeli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habeti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is another source of information yet to be used in this discussion: the literary material. There is quite a lot of good material for first-century Egypt, although the sources for the second century are exiguous. The great advantage of literary material is that it tends to give a contemporary view of the general situation in a given context whilst the documentary evidence tends to illuminate one unit at one particular moment without providing any kind of context. The accuracy of the context provided and the quality of the information available to the various sources is more problematic.

The first major source on the Roman garrison is Strabo who probably visited Egypt during the tenure of the second prefect of the province Aelius Gallus. He also had information about the activities of the next prefect, Petronius, particularly his dealings with the Nubians. He is, therefore, particularly useful for the situation immediately following annexation. He details the garrison of Egypt thus: "There are three legions of soldiers, one in the city and the others in the chora. In addition there are nine Roman cohorts, three in the city, three on the border with Ethiopia at Syene, as a guard for those places, and three elsewhere in the chora. There are three horse-units which are likewise positioned in the important places". Strabo also, in his description of particular sites in Egypt, says
that one of the legions was based at Babylon. He also alludes to a guard of some kind of the Hermopolite and another guard of the Thebaid. This gives a fairly clear picture of the positioning of the Roman units in the late first century B.C. The garrison consisted of three legions, three alae and nine cohorts. One of these legions and three cohorts were in Alexandria, another legion was at Nikopolis and the third legion's station remains unknown. The other known garrison is Syene where three cohorts were stationed. This leaves three alae, three cohorts and a legion unaccounted for. There are, however two garrisons whose troops we know nothing about, the Thebaid and the Hermopolite. The suggestion has been made that the third legion was based in the Thebaid which seems to be reasonable.

The next literary source that gives any details of the situation in Egypt is the famous summary of the military situation of A.D. 23 which, Tacitus tells us, Tiberius delivered to the Senate. Egypt was held down by two legions; the same number as held Africa. The auxiliary forces for the entire empire were neque multo secus in virium to the legions, however, it was too difficult to trace the placing of the units in the various provinces. Tacitus's sources would be very good for this speech and it would seem unlikely that he was reconstructing the factual element of
Tacitus's attention was again focused on the military situation in the East in his account of the civil wars of 69. Nero, in the face of the growing crisis in the West, concentrated his forces, and recalled the ala Siliani (another unit which was probably named after its commander) which had been sent off to Egypt. It is possible that the unit never arrived in Egypt since there is no documentary evidence of the unit being there and it was a relatively recent transfer from Africa. Nero showed great interest in Egypt and may have been planning a major campaign in the area when the situation in the West became desperate. In the panic at the end of the reign, he is said to have looked to Egypt as a possible place to retreat to. In adding up the potential of the Flavian forces in 69,
Tacitus points to the two legions in Egypt but makes no mention of the auxiliary units. 37

Josephus takes very little notice of cohorts. He is interested in the legions and talks about the legions as if they were all the army. Yet, the order of battle provided by Josephus shows that the legions provided only about a third of the army. 38 When Agrippa spoke to the Jews in order to persuade them of the futility of revolt, a topic dear to Josephus's heart, he detailed the wealth and the population of Egypt. The 7,500,000 Egyptians were held down by just two legions stationed in Alexandria. Ignoring the auxiliary forces aided the rhetorical position of Agrippa, but it is still significant that the units could be ignored. 39 When it comes to the end of the war, it is the legions that disperse to the various stations whilst the auxiliaries disappear. 40 It must be significant that Josephus and Tacitus seem to concentrate on the legions to the virtual exclusion of the auxiliary units in spite of the recognition of the numerical importance of these units.

Strabo is the one first-century figure who does stress the place of the auxiliaries. When he describes the forces sent out against the Arabs under Aelius Gallus there were 10,000 foot-soldiers drawn from the Romans of Egypt and then there were the allies, the Jews and the Nabateans. This
force appears to be two legions. Auxiliaries do not, at first sight, seem to have any place in the expedition. When this force of two legions was away, there was an invasion of Southern Egypt by the Ethiopians. This force was repulsed by 10,000 foot soldiers and 800 cavalry. This does not count the troops in Syene. The combination of these forces suggests a total garrison of about 21,000 troops which approximates to the number of troops that would be included in three legions and twelve auxiliary units, estimating 5000 for each legion and 500 for each auxiliary unit. Strabo does not, therefore, distinguish in his calculations between the auxiliaries and the legionaries. For Strabo the auxiliaries were an integral part of the army, but for Josephus and Tiberius, via Tacitus, the emphasis is on legions, almost to the exclusion of auxiliaries from the account. Does Strabo invalidate any conclusions that could be drawn from the historians?

The conclusion that can be drawn from the historians must not be that the auxiliary units were not important to the Roman army. The account of the revolt of the Batavians would be incomprehensible if auxiliaries were not an important part of the army. Clearly, this is not the picture that emerges from the catalogue of the forces of Vespasian marching against the Jews. Writers from Strabo onwards seem to acknowledge the importance of the auxiliary
units as a numerical and military part of the army, yet, when considering the numbers and dispositions of the auxilia, they appear badly informed or uninterested in these units. To Tacitus and to Josephus the Roman army seems to be synonymous with the Roman legions. This may be more understandable if the troops were mainly or often irregulars, still raised for specific tasks and functions as late as 69. They would not have received the same level of attention from a contemporary, or almost contemporary author, as the legions.

There is also an important ideological point in this emphasis on the legion, since the legion was still the Roman citizen unit; the Roman people in the field. The legions had provided Rome with her Empire and although to the historian dealing with the documentary evidence the differences between the two types of units may appear to be more ones of size than of function, to Tacitus and to Josephus the differences were of tradition. The legions had inherited a glorious starring role in Roman history and conquest. The auxiliaries had a tradition of being extras of inferior fighting ability and status. Irrespective of the military realities, the basis of the army was still the legion whilst the auxiliary units were supplementary. Thus, while it is possible that Tiberius did not work out where all these auxiliaries were, due to the irregular nature of the auxilia
in the early principate, in a more fundamental way it was not important where the auxilia were since the important military units were the legions. The question of relative size of units must also be taken into account irrespective of their overall contribution to the Roman military effort.

The auxiliary units of the period were named after their commanders and must have undergone frequent name changes. There are no diplomas or the like and the Egyptian evidence shows troops with Roman and non-Roman names serving in the auxilia. There is a strong possibility that the whole structure of the auxiliary units was looser, freer and more irregular than in the developed Flavian and post-Flavian period. The "auxiliary system" did not spring into being fully formed under Augustus and we must have a more evolutionary model of the development of the "system" than previously.44 The auxiliary units were probably raised on the same kind of basis as they had been raised during the Republic.

Our relative ignorance of the pre-Flavian auxilia in spite of the obviously important role they played in military campaigns, may be explained in several ways. The first is ideological. Roman and Greek writers did not see the auxiliary units as important. The second is a matter of scale and narrative practicality. A legion of 5,000 men was
always more important as a military unit than a unit of about 500 men. People noticed what a legion did, while the actions of the auxiliary units were more difficult to follow. Thirdly, the nature of the auxilia was not constant. The units of this period had yet to reach the developed form we see in the later centuries.

There are no other literary sources on the garrison of Egypt but the diplomas and one inscription do allow us to estimate the whole of the garrison of Egypt. The inscription is from Koptos and was published as CIL III 6627 with extensive commentary. It, at first sight, seems to be little more than a list of names of soldiers by centuries. The document is fragmentary. There is a list of soldiers from two fourth cohorts, from two fifth and sixth cohorts, and the beginnings of the list of two seventh cohorts. These seem to have been arranged in two columns each column having the cohorts four to seven. All the soldiers were Roman citizens. The end of the stone has also survived. This contains a summary of the previously provided information. The first column details the number of horsemen on the expedition. There were 424 horsemen, five decurions, one duplicarius, and four sesquiplicarii drawn from three alae. Column two starts by mentioning the I Theban cohort and continues by listing three centurions of the cohort, one of whom was in command. It then summarises the contribution of
the cohorts to the expedition as being ten centurions, sixty-one cavalry and 782 soldiers drawn from seven cohorts. The stone had been set up to honour the soldiery who had taken part in the rebuilding of the roads through the Eastern desert. The dating of the inscription is of fundamental importance to the understanding of the military situation in Egypt. It is virtually incontrovertible that the inscription refers to two legions, the state of affairs we know from Tacitus's summary of A.D. 23 and which was the standard garrison throughout the first century. The names of the soldiers might give a clue to the date. There are no cognomina included in the lists. This suggests an earlier dating for the inscription since cognomina were used after Claudius in inscriptions. Yet, this is a very unsatisfactory method of dating anything and can only be used as a rule of thumb. All the patronymics given show that the father had had the same praenomen as the son. In the thirty-six cases here this is a remarkable coincidence which suggests that either the army recruited just the first-born son for legionary service, which given the high rate of infant mortality is preposterous, or that the legionaries were given citizenship upon enlistment with an artificial patronymic. The origins of the legionaries are also of interest. The Egyptian element does not form a majority of the troops. They probably form about 20% and 25% if those born in camp are assumed to have been Egyptian, which is far
from certain. Over 40% of the troops seem to have come from Asia Minor and many of them from Galatia which accords well with the Galatian origins of XXII Deiotariana. However, both legions had a sizeable element drawn from that province and the troops were far from exclusively drawn from there. There are only two soldiers who can safely be placed as coming from the West, from Lyon, and perhaps one comes from Italy. Also, the numbers involved are quite small and a statistical analysis would be unsafe. So, the soldiers themselves tell us that there was some local recruiting but most recruitment seems to have been carried out in Asia. There are three Iulii and one Flavius on the inscription but it would be rash to use that kind of level of information alone to propose an early Flavian date. There is only one Antonius and that is T. Antonius. Archaeology can provide no dating material from the forts along the roads. There are two routes across the desert mentioned, the Koptos-Myos Hormos route and the Koptos-Berenike route. For Strabo the most important port seems to have been Myos Hormos, while Pliny stresses the importance of the Berenike road. But the difference is more apparent than real. The later, fuller discussion in Strabo makes quite clear that although the harbour at Berenike was far inferior to the harbour at Myos Hormos, and it was at Myos Hormos that the fleet was based, the road went as far as Berenike, and it was to, and from, Berenike that the fleet sailed for India. There is no
mention of a road to Myos Hormos. The road to Berenike was, as we may have guessed from the name of the town, built by Philadelphus and was, therefore, an old established route. The other description of the Eastern trade routes that we have is the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, probably dating from between A.D. 40 and 80. This document lays equal emphasis on the two ports of Myos Hormos and Berenike, as does the slightly earlier archive of Nikanor, dealing with transport across the desert. The literary evidence for the route is not conclusive. If there was a route across from Myos Hormos to Koptos, Pliny was either not informed about it or did not feel that it was important. Strabo thought that the route across from Berenike was likewise the most important and the author of the Periplus was unconcerned with such details, but perhaps felt that the ports were equally important. A further complication is that the exploitation of the quarries of the desert, which, in all probability, were near the Myos Hormos road, means that a crude comparison of the dating of the epigraphic material along the roads would not be a valid comparison.

Where does this analysis leave us? The dating that had been accepted in the CIL publication is under severe strain. There is no good evidence to propose an Augustan date for the inscription. The large number of soldiers in the legions from Asia Minor is inconclusive, especially when we consider
that one Egyptian cohort received a very large number of recruits from Asia in 117. There is no convincing standard against which we can measure the move to local recruiting and it is impossible and unwise to construct a graph measuring the level of local recruitment against time. The level of local recruitment and the low level of Western influence on the legion might suggest that we are looking for a later rather than an earlier date, but such arguments tend to prove circular in the long term. The mention of the cohort I Thbaeoreum is also inconclusive since this cohort is one of the earliest attested in Egypt, though considering my earlier remarks about the lack of standardisation in the pre-Flavian auxilia, I am predisposed to date the appearance of such a regular-looking cohort to the mid first century. The literary evidence is decidedly inconclusive. Although this would cumulatively point to the fact that Pliny the Elder, or his source, was unaware of a major road to the North of the Berenike route, this only demonstrates that Pliny's sources were not good since the archive of Nikanor suggests that both routes were in use before the earliest possible date for inscription. The archaeological evidence, in the present state of excavation is unhelpful. The nomenclature of the legionaries is again inconclusive, with only a few Imperial gentilicia, although one of those was Flavius. The absence of cognomina suggests an earlier date but the problems with such general guides is that they do
not leave room for exceptions and presume a standardisation of fashion that is impractical and impossible. This kind of long honorific, inscription might be just the kind we might expect to follow older, more conservative, conventions. On balance, therefore, I would suggest a mid or even late first-century date. I feel that it is virtually certain that these forces represented the whole of the Egyptian garrison. This means that the Egyptian garrison was at this period composed of two legions, three alae and seven cohorts.

Other snapshots of the Roman army's total force include the four diplomas. The two earlier diplomas of 83 and 105 are far superior to the diploma of 156-161, but the diploma of 179 solves many of the problems of the earlier document. These first two give Egypt a garrison of three alae and seven cohorts in 83 and of three alae and nine cohorts in 105. The 179 diploma gives Egypt a garrison of four alae and nine cohorts. These, together with the testimony of Strabo, allow us to draw a fairly clear picture of the numerical strength of the army in Egypt. In doing these calculations, I will work on the basis of standard paper strengths for the various units of 5,000 for the legions and 500 for the auxiliaries.

These figures are dependent upon a standard estimate of the numbers of troops in a unit but the real numbers may
have risen or fallen depending upon the particular circumstances of the unit. There are two Egyptian documents that give overall figures for numbers in units. The pridianum of the cohort I Hispanorum veteranorum from Stobii of 105 gives the strength of the unit as 546 men of whom 119 were cavalry. A similar type of document relating to the I Augusta Praetoria Lusitanorum equitata gives a total strength of 505 men of whom 114 were horsemen and 19 camel riders. A document from 117 recording the arrival of new recruits to the same unit does not give an absolute total for the unit but the number of recruits, 126, must be significant. The combination of the two pridiana suggest that the conventional figure for the strength of these units is probably correct. The large number of recruits from Asia may have strengthened the unit in extraordinary circumstances. The Jewish revolt was at its height and was creating considerable problems for the Roman forces. The recruitment of these men then could be as a response to heavy losses during the revolt or a strengthening of the unit to above its paper strength prior to the unit going into action. Faced with this evidence it seems reasonable to work with the estimated strengths of 500 men per cohort.

Strabo's description of the Roman forces has already been discussed. It will be sufficient to go over the main conclusions of that discussion. Strabo estimates the forces
available to Petronius and Aelius Gallus from the Egyptian garrison to have been about 22,000 (10,000 taken to fight the Arabs, 10,800 to repel the invasion of Egypt, and the garrison of Syene, probably made up of 1,000 men). This was made up of three legions (15,000 men), three alae (1,500 men) and nine cohorts (4,500 men). With a certain neatness, this gives us a total of 21,000 men. Before A.D.23 the number of legions in Egypt was reduced to two. By the mid-first century the number of cohorts had also been reduced to seven. This gives a mid-first century total of 15,000.

In 83, the garrison consisted of two legions (10,000 men), three alae (1,500 men) and seven cohorts (3,500 men) which once more gives us a total of 15,000. In 105, just before the re-ordering of the East due to the expeditions of Trajan, there were two legions (10,000 men), three alae (1,500 men), and nine cohorts and, if we include the cohort of Roman citizens, ten cohorts (5,000 men) which would give a total of 16,500. Two of the cohorts were in Judaea. Although there may have been a brief raising of the garrison to three legions during the last years of Trajan, the second-century province really only had one legion. The early second-century garrison probably consisted of three alae (1,500 men), nine, or possibly ten, cohorts (4,500-5,000 men), and one legion (5,000 men). This gives a total of 11,000 to 11,500 men. From the diploma of 179 we can get
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a picture of four alae (2,000 men), and ten cohorts (5,000 men) and one legion (5,000 men). A total force of 12,000 men. As far as I can tell the situation remained relatively constant into the third century but one cohort does appear to leave the garrison suggesting a total force of 11,500 men.

There is, therefore, a clear change in the manpower levels of the garrison between the beginning of the first century and the late second century. This is not surprising since the figures of Strabo refer to a time when the province had recently been conquered and there was a major military undertaking going on with the invasion of the lands to the South of Egypt. It would be unrealistic to compare the levels of the garrisons at the two extremes of the period. A better base for calculations would be the situation after the withdrawal of the third legion. I assume that the auxiliary units remained the same in 23 as they were in Strabo's day, although there is no evidence for this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.23</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.50</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>103.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early II century</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>68.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late II century</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>71.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variation in the levels of the garrison during the first century was quite small. However, in the second century there was a quite noticeable reduction in the numbers of troops. The withdrawal of the legion was not compensated for by an increase in the number of auxiliaries which seems to have remained relatively constant throughout the period. The garrison declined by between a quarter and a third during the second century.

The distribution of these troops is problematic. The detailed survey of the evidence for each auxiliary unit earlier in the chapter failed to establish clear bases for many of the units. The attestations were dispersed over considerable distances although it is clear that there was an administrative centre for each of the auxiliary units. Units could also be seen to operate within regions such as Lower and Upper Egypt but these do not appear to have been absolute divisions of spheres of operation since soldiers can appear belonging to the same unit at similar periods in both Upper and Lower Egypt. Only a very general conclusion is possible. The soldiers of a particular unit were dispersed, usually over quite wide regions but not across the whole of the country.

This chapter has laid down a framework within which we can study the role and function of the army in the province.
and elsewhere. A first element of this must be to examine the role of the army within the East as a whole. The evidence produced here forms a basis for the writing of a history of the Egyptian army within this military context of the Eastern Mediterranean.
The Army at War

The use of the army in times of war must illuminate our views of the function of the Roman army in Egypt. The strategic importance of Egypt as the gateway to the East, a convenient point to assemble troops to fight a Parthian or an Arabian campaign, or a strategic reserve designed to secure the more troublesome areas of the East such as Judaea and controlling important sea lanes to the West must be considered, as must the possible threat from the neighbouring tribes of nomads. This is in addition to any considerations of internal security which will be dealt with in later chapters.

Most of the campaigning of the army launched from Egypt took place in the very early years of the Roman occupation and was directed against the tribes to the South of the country. The knowledge the Romans had of these tribes was scanty. Strabo, in book sixteen of his Geography, wrote about this area. He peopled it with nomads, named after their eating habits, with the exception of a few groups who had been able to establish stable bases on the coast. The cave-dwellers, the fish-eaters, the root-eaters, the marsh-men, the seed-eaters, the meat-eaters, the bitch-milkers,
the elephant-eaters, the bird-eaters, the locust-eaters and
the turtle-eaters were all to be found around Meroe, to the
South of Syene.\(^1\) Pliny the Elder found mention of cannibals
in the area as well.\(^2\) Beyond the fringe of the Empire,
knowledge and myth became inseparable. The main peoples who
lived to the South of Egypt were the Blemmyes, the Nubians,
and the Aethiopians and in the early period the most
prominent polity in the area was Meroe. Our two references
to its rulers both mention the Queen Candace.\(^3\) Pliny was
evidently a little surprised to find a queen in the late 60s
A.D. with the same name as the queen of c.30 B.C. and
concluded that the name was hereditary and went with the
office.

Cornelius Gallus, the first prefect of Egypt,
commemorated his campaigns to the south of Egypt in an
inscription erected at Philae. He claimed to have defeated a
rebellion in the Thebaid in fifteen days, defeating the
enemy in battle twice and capturing five cities. He then
proceeded to campaign to the South of Egypt, progressing
beyond where Roman forces had previously gone and defeating
the Aethiopian king, forcing him to send ambassadors to meet
him at Philae.\(^4\) The victories of Gallus brought only a
temporary peace to the frontier. His successor Aelius Gallus
collected troops for a grandiose campaign into Arabia. He
collected Nabataean and Jewish troops as well as 10,000 from
the garrison in Egypt. These forces, having sailed down the Red Sea, were eventually defeated, not by force of arms but by the terrible climate and disease. Aelius Gallus was forced to retreat in some disarray, blaming the Nabataean Syllaesus for the defeat.\(^5\) Whilst Gallus was away in the distant regions with sizable numbers of the Egyptian garrison, the Aethiopians of Meroe attacked Egypt. They took Syene, Elephantine and Philae, defeating the Roman garrison. Petronius, the prefect, gathered together his forces and marched to meet the threat. Against vastly superior numbers, as all great Roman generals did, Petronius defeated the invaders and forced them to retreat. The queen was defeated and the town of Pselchis fell. The Romans continued their march capturing Premnis and the capital Napata, garrisoning the first two towns but destroying Napata. Petronius was then forced by the season to return to the milder climate of Alexandria. Candace, thinking that the Roman general's strength had been drawn, gathered her forces and marched against the garrisons of Nubia. Petronius returned in time to save his men. Candace sued for peace and the ambassadors were sent to Augustus who granted them all they wanted.\(^6\)

These campaigns mark the high-water mark of Rome's expansion southwards\(^7\) and although ultimately unsuccessful were significant enough to be mentioned in the *Res Gestae*.\(^8\)
The southern reaches had some interest for the Romans, perhaps because they had not been reached by any other Mediterranean army, and Nero was attracted by the prospect of further explorations in the area. The evidence of the build up of forces in Egypt under Nero is incontrovertible. The XV Apollinaris was in Egypt when Titus was sent to collect it to put down the Jewish revolt in A.D. 66. The ala Siliani was transferred from Egypt to face the threat of the rebellions in the west by Nero, only to arrive in Italy too late. When the riots in Alexandria got out of hand, Ti. Iulius Alexander sent in not only the two legions stationed at Nikopolis but also 2,000 troops moved by chance to the area. It seems clear that these preparations were for a campaign against the Aethiopians which Nero may have intended to lead himself. Caecina Tuscus was executed for the heinous crime of bathing in the establishment erected for the forthcoming visit of the emperor. In spite of what appears to have been a large concentration of forces in the region, the only military action was the sending of troops across the border as a pseudo-scientific expedition to discover the source of the Nile. Seneca wrote "I indeed heard the two centurions, sent by Nero, who loves dearly all virtues but especially truth, to discover the source of the Nile." Pliny the Elder took a more sanguine view of proceedings saying that the expedition took place at a time
when Nero was considering war against the Aethiopians as well as against the Caspian Gates. 14

With the failure of Nero to carry out his invasion plans, the border between the tribes to the South and the Roman armed forces seems to have remained fairly quiet. There are no reports of major expeditions or disputes until the third century when the Blemmyes took advantage of the troubles of the Roman empire to invade. 15 The only account of any kind of trouble in the area is an inscription erected under Hadrian recording the success of a pursuit of raiding agriophagoi, the wild men, who were chased for two days and then cut down by the Roman forces. 16 This nicely illustrates the probable nature of the military threat posed by the peoples across the Egyptian frontier. Strabo is particularly contemptuous of their military capabilities. The country to the South was well guarded by the three cohorts stationed at Syene even though these were not complete and the peoples in the area were described as "neither numerous or warlike, although they were once thought to be so since they often attacked the unguarded as bandits". 17 The threat to the security of Egypt was not so much an invading army like the one fought off by Petronius but the razzia which the Hadrianic inscription mentions. The importance of this assessment is that such military actions to deal with these small incursions would almost never reach the attention of
the literary sources and perhaps would not even have produced inscriptions to testify to the conflicts. Aelius Aristeides mid-second-century oration in praise of the imperial city mentions the trouble spots of the Roman empire: Mauretania, Dacia, and the Red Sea. The last comes as something of a surprise. Both Strabo and Pliny point to the Red Sea as a centre of pirate activity and we might wonder whether this kind of low intensity threat was sufficient to explain the comparatively large garrison of Egypt.

An understanding of the function of the garrison to some extent must necessitate an understanding of the military history of the eastern half of the Roman empire. The main events that seem to have any effect upon the garrison of Egypt were the campaigns of Corbulo, the Jewish Revolts, the annexation of Arabia, the Parthian war of Trajan and the general settlement under Hadrian. For the second century the sources are much poorer but in the mid-second century Verus went East and there were further campaigns at the end of the century.

Corbulo's eastern campaigns began with the discovery of the poor condition of the troops of the East, a discovery that was a topos of Roman military campaigning. He brought
to the East the XV Apollinaris and the III Augusta together vexillations from Illyricum and from Egypt with cavalry and infantry auxiliaries.\textsuperscript{20} The conclusion of these campaigns with the death of Corbulo led to the dispersal of the army. The III Augusta went to Moesia where it was to become a Vespasianic legion in the civil wars.\textsuperscript{21} As already noted XV Apollinaris did not return to the Danube, where it had come from, but to Egypt to await Nero's next expedition. That expedition never happened since the East was soon disturbed by the uprising in Judaea. Nero appointed Vespasian to the campaign and Vespasian sent his son Titus to Egypt to collect the legion there. Titus does not seem to have collected any other troops from the garrison before proceeding to join his father's expedition. This was halted by the proclamation of Vespasian as emperor. The importance of Egypt and the legions stationed there is reflected in the fact that it was to Alexandria that Vespasian went upon announcing his challenge.\textsuperscript{22} Vespasian was anxious to secure the grain which could have enabled him to exercise some control over the Roman urban population but still this is not an adequate explanation of the importance of Alexandria which became the alternative capital to Rome during the operations. Egypt was secured and easily controlled by that trusted Flavian ally, Tiberius Iulius Alexander. Alexandria was the second city of the Mediterranean and the use of this city as a base for operations by both Antony and Vespasian
must be of some significance though we can only speculate as to what this was. The cult of Alexander, the messianic movements current in the East immediately suggest themselves and the sensitivity of Egypt for the emperor, reflected in the banning of all senators from the province, may be more than a fear for the grain supply and of a new Cleopatra.

The victory of Vespasian led to the elevation of his son, Titus, who was put in charge of the campaign against the Jews. He had the three legions of his father stationed in Judaea and to these he added XII from Syria and vexillations of the III and the XXII from Alexandria which he collected from Nikopolis. After the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple, Titus disbanded his armies leading the bulk of his forces back to Alexandria. The V and the XV went back with him but, on arrival in Alexandria, Titus decided that they were surplus to requirements and sent them back to their old stations, Moesia and Pannonia. The restoration of these legions to their old bases suggests a restoration of order following the civil wars. It also shows the temporary nature of the increase in the forces in Egypt. Titus delayed the return of the legions until he had reached Alexandria and we may wonder whether, in the uncertainty of the times, Titus was deliberately keeping a substantial element of the military forces of the East together under his personal control or
was contemplating a military expedition himself. The general uncertainty surrounding the throne is illustrated by the Suetonius story that Titus was suspected of having designs on a Kingdom of his own, given credence by his appearance at the consecration of the Apis bull in Alexandria wearing a diadem. The centrality of Alexandria in the politics of the empire again seems to be evident. 25

The East remained peaceful throughout the years of control by the Flavians. The next major episode in the military history of the period was the disturbance caused by the military events of the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. These were the annexation of Arabia c.106, the Parthian wars of Trajan, the Jewish revolt of the diaspora, the Parthian scare of 123, 26 and the Bar Kochba rebellion. By the end of this period, the II Traiana was the one legion in Egypt, the III Cyrenaica was in Arabia, and the XXII Deiotariana had disappeared. It was clearly a period of rapid change within the garrison of Egypt. 27

III Cyrenaica is known to have sent some troops out of Egypt in 106/7 to serve in Arabia. Two letters from C. Iulius Apollinarius emanate from Arabia. In February of an unknown year, he wrote to his mother, Tasoucharion, to inform her that he had become a principalis and was, therefore, exempted from the hard manual labour that the
troops of the legion were performing. He would send her some expensive gifts but he was as yet unsure of the regularity of communications between his station and Egypt. The second letter, addressed to Iulius Sabinus, his father, detailed how Apollinarius had achieved his promotion to *librarius* and thus avoided manual labour. The letter is dated from 107 and mentions that the commander of the legion who brought about the promotion was the governor of Arabia, Claudius Severus. This strongly suggests that the entire legion had been transferred out of Egypt in 106/7 to either form the garrison of Arabia or to assist in the process of annexation. The legion, however, has been firmly placed in Nikopolis with the XXII in 119 and another letter from the Karanis archive suggests that Apollinarius was in Egypt in the same year. Under Trajan, the unit appeared at Dura erecting a triumphal arch and a vexillation of the unit built a gate in Jerusalem. To add to the problems, the legion appears to have been part of a force collected by Hadrian to fight the Parthians in 123 which in itself would not be a problem but the legion with which it is associated was the II Traiana which has recently been placed in Judaea in the early 120s. An officer of the legion was rewarded by Hadrian for his valour during the Jewish war. The legion then reappeared in Bostra from 140 and remains in Arabia until well beyond our period of study.
The propensity of the III Cyrenaica to advertise its presence across the whole of the Eastern region is contrasted by the disappearance of the XXII legion. The legion's last attestation is in 119 (See above). The legion's disappearance has been connected to the Bar Kochba revolt: "Its disappearance has been thought due to total destruction or disbandment during the Jewish revolt. Concrete evidence for this was suggested to be S. Julius Africanus' remark that the legion's wine was said to have been 'poisoned by the Pharisees'." There is also some evidence of a damnatio memoriae of a legion in Judaea which was not the VI, II, nor X. Hadrian's failure to use the traditional formulation to notify the Senate that he and the legions were well signifies the magnitude of the problems that the Romans faced during the Bar Kochba revolt and the complete disappearance of the legion from the battle order after this revolt suggests a military disaster which would have made refounding the legion around a nucleus of survivors either impractical or in some way distasteful to the Roman authorities.

In addition to these legions we must also consider the other forces of the East which may have had some role to play in the troop manoeuvres. The VI Ferrata served in the garrison of Arabia but left before the III arrived to take up permanent occupancy probably before 140. XV Apollinaris
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disappeared from Carnuntum before Trajan's campaigns in the East and reappears in Cappadocia c. 135. The whereabouts of the legion in the meantime are largely unknown. The II Traiana may be firmly placed in Egypt c. 127 and perhaps was there from earlier, although it was in Judaea in the early 120s. 37

The problems of understanding the deployment of legions in the East in this period are made worse by the frequent use of vexillations, and the flexibility the Roman military demonstrated in the use of such vexillations has complicated modern attempts to explain events. The movement of XV Apollinaris under Nero and Vespasian warns us against being too rigid in our approach to Roman strategic dispositions. Let us look at III Cyrenaica. The involvement of the legion in the annexation of Arabia is clearly attested but it is not clear how long the legion stayed there. 38 A short period of service in Arabia is a distinct possibility. It seems certain that the legion went East with Trajan. So, for a brief period, the garrison of Egypt had been reduced to one legion, a situation that was altered by the return of III Cyrenaica by 119. This return was in the immediate aftermath of a major revolt and it may be wondered whether the garrison was further strengthened by Trajan or Hadrian. There are two possible candidates for this strengthening of the legionary forces, XV and II. A
centurion of XV Apollinaris is attested at Mons Claudianus during the reign of Trajan.\textsuperscript{39} There is also an inscription attesting to the foundation of a colony in Cyrene by a former \textit{primus pilus} of III Cyrenaica who went on to become \textit{praefectus castrorum} of XV Apollinaris before being sent to found this colony by Trajan.\textsuperscript{40} The coincidence of a man serving as centurion in an Egyptian legion, then in a legion which is without any known station during the reign of Trajan, then going off to found a colony in Cyrene is notable and might suggest that the centurion at Mons Claudianus was not just a stray centurion, a long way from home.

II Traiana's connections with Egypt in the later second-century are clear. It is not clear when the legion arrived in Egypt. There are two papyrological documents of the early second century that might suggest that the legion was in Egypt with the III and the XXII. However, both readings are highly debatable.\textsuperscript{41} If the legion was in Egypt in 127, but was previously attested in Judaea, the transfer of the legion to deal with the Jewish uprising seems problematic. Yet, the evidence of the legion in Judaea is not strong and the possibility must remain that the representatives of II Traiana in Judaea were a vexillation. The vexillation of II Traiana and III Cyrenaica taken East in 123 could then have come from Egypt not from Judaea or
the vexillations were serving in Judaea, away from the legions, and were taken from there. This would mean that there were three legions based in Egypt from c.110 which were then joined by the XV. It would be a major gathering of forces in preparation for Trajan's campaigns to the East. The model has something to recommend it, but there are other lines of development which could be tried. It is conceivable that III Cyrenaica left Egypt in 106 and did not return until the Jewish revolt of 116, that the vexillation of 123 was taken from Judaea, where the whole of II Traiana was based, and the mentions of the XV were lucky coincidences, since the legion was based in Cappodocia from the time it left Pannonia. This would mean that Egypt under Trajan was a one-legion province, as it was to become in the later second century. Extensive use of vexillations and the use of units on special campaigns rather than in permanent transfers must further confuse an already fluid situation yet the evidence from Egypt is sufficiently complex to allow some conclusions to be reached about the strategic planning of the Roman government, if not the type of conclusions that seemed to be initially required, but first we must consider later developments.

There are only two more pieces of evidence to consider since the Egyptian forces of the second century do not appear in any of the accounts of the campaigns in the East.
This may be because of the reduction in the legionary garrison to one legion, probably in the aftermath of the Bar Kochba revolt, but also we should consider the decline in the quantity and the quality of the source material for the second century. In 232, Severus Alexander commanded Roman forces against the Parthian empire once more. His biographer tells us that he suffered a mutiny at Antioch of members of a legion. The legionaries had been misbehaving and raiding the women's baths. The Emperor's attempt to restore order was not received well by the troops concerned. Herodian, in a shorter report of the incident tells us merely that there was a mutiny by the Egyptian and Syrian troops in the army. It seems that the II Traiana was brought from Egypt to take part in the expedition. We only know of the involvement of this Egyptian legion through the accidental reference to the revolt and the soldiers' immorality.

The strategic position of the Egyptian army, as shown best by the evidence from the first century and the massive changes under Trajan and Hadrian was intimately involved with the whole of the Eastern front. Corbulo, Nero, Vespasian, Titus, Trajan, Hadrian and, in the third century, Severus Alexander saw the Egyptian garrison as an integral part of the Eastern military machine. As a gathering point for major expeditions Alexandria had several advantages:
abundant grain supply, a large military camp, direct sea communications and a lively trade. Another point of collection would be Antioch, but too great a concentration of legions under the Syrian governor was to be avoided. The Alexandria-Antioch axis was the key link in the Eastern military organisation. Our difficulties with the Trajanic and Hadrianic garrisons show not only the partial nature of the evidence but also the relative flexibility of the Roman army. We should not over-estimate the "scientific" nature of Roman strategy as some historians have been prone to do. The demands of the everyday event and of the political position were almost certainly greater than the demands of the strategy and the strategy must, in many cases, elude us since the vast array of factors at work behind the diplomacy and the planning of the emperors cannot be quantified. Too often modern accounts talk about the nature of the military threat as demonstrated by subsequent campaigns and assume that the thinking behind the strategy in the East must be analogous to the planning to meet the "Russian threat". Such analogies with modern "scientific" planners, either explicit or implicit imply that the political and military demands placed upon the Roman army were the same as those placed upon modern western armies. This can hardly be the case. Even the very concept of strategy as it is known in modern times cannot necessarily be assumed to have been a major factor in Roman thinking. The ability of modern historians
to tie themselves in knots trying to place the correct number of legions in the right provinces in the right periods for the right officers suggests a rigid view of Roman military dispositions which is not reflected in the evidence for this period. To try and parcel up each province with a set number of legions disregards the large scale use of vexillations. The military history of the East, as it has been written over the last few years, sometimes appears to be a version of musical chairs, played blindfold. We must approach the military history of the East with more caution and with more circumspection. The approach may allow us to say less but be more confident of what we do say and the meaning of our evidence. To return to Egypt, we can see that the importance of Alexandria and of Egypt to the Romans was not just the power an invader might have if they could cut off the grain supply to Rome but also the politically important position of the control of the second city of the Mediterranean, the city of Alexander. The city and Egypt were garrisoned as part of the Roman army in the East and, when there was a need, the legions, or parts of the legions were moved elsewhere.
The Alexandrian Uprisings

The city of Alexandria was a prominent centre of Mediterranean life and culture and was of great political importance to the Romans, as we have seen from the previous chapter. The city has always had important connections to other Mediterranean cultures and civilizations and elements of the cultural heterogeneity of the city can still be seen today. The city has always been different from the rest of Egypt and in the Classical period this difference was conceptualized in the description of the city as ad Aegyptum rather than in AegyptC. Alexander's city was associated with Greek culture and was a major centre of learning and literature in the Hellenistic period yet there were many cultural elements in the classical city which were non-Greek. The city became a centre of Egyptian and Jewish religion and as Egypt became increasingly Hellenised the differences in culture between Alexandria and the chora must have lessened. Alexandria, however, was one of the great cities of the Mediterranean and this factor alone justifies a separate treatment of the city and the disturbances within it over the period. My division of the troubles in Egypt has the effect of separating the anti-semitic rioting in Alexandria from the Jewish revolt in the chora in 115-7,
events which are normally considered together. My overall topic is, however, the reactions of and the problems faced by the Roman army and the similarities of the episodes in the chora justify this division as does the picture that emerges of the problems of Alexandria in the following pages.

For Alexandrian history we are almost totally dependent upon literary or sub-literary texts for our information. No papyri have been preserved in the city, there are relatively few inscriptions and the archaeological work has suffered from the fact that there is a modern city on the site, allowing only patchy excavation which has tended to illuminate the later city, not the Ptolemaic or Roman city.

Strabo mentions a disturbance that took place during the office of the prefect Petronius. He tells us that Petronius held off a dangerous stone throwing mob of countless numbers merely by using his bodyguard. He also mentions the campaign of Cornelius Gallus against the Thebaid, a campaign which was successfully accomplished with only a few soldiers. Strabo's main point is that the Egyptians were not warlike. The story is thus meant to depict not the unruliness of the mob but their ineffectiveness. Although the cheek of the Alexandrian mob
was famous, or notorious, there is no record of any other disturbance in the rest of Augustus's reign. The main problems that afflicted the city in the early first century centred on the relationship between the Greek and Jewish communities. The troubles experienced by the Jewish community in the first and early second centuries A.D. are famous. It is, however, necessary to once more go over the details of these disturbances in order to observe the position of the army during these disturbances and to establish a context for both the Alexandrian revolts and, to a certain extent, the less well attested revolt of 115-117.

The Jewish community of Egypt was undoubtedly very large and important but actual figures for the size of the population are elusive. Philo's statement that there were a million Jews in Egypt seems to be something of an over-estimate. All the ancient population figures given for Egypt were probably inflated and Philo, for dramatic purposes, was interested in inflating the figures for the Jewish element. Jews do appear in the chora but there are comparatively few attestations. Most of the documentary evidence of Jewish activities comes from non-Jewish sources and concerns the activities of the Jews in revolt or in Alexandria. There are ostraka from the Jewish community at Edfu which attest the collection of the Jewish tax in the period from A.D. 70 to A.D. 116 and there is good evidence
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for a Jewish community of some type at Oxyrhynchus.\(^5\) There may also have been more Jews than our geographically biased evidence reflects as one of the early centres of Jewish influence was Upper Egypt and there may have been substantial numbers of Jews in the Delta.\(^6\) Communities, needing to have access to a synagogue, were probably not evenly dispersed across Egypt. Spotting the Jewish community when one of the members of that community appears in a document may also be no easy task. If the Jew was called Isaac or Abraham, this is a relatively simple activity but many of the Jews seem to have had names which were not religiously specific.\(^7\) There is no evidence for the size of communities outside Alexandria and the only evidence for the size of the population within the city comes from Philo. He tells us that the Jews were spread across half the city and formed the majority of the population in two of the five districts. This would suggest a population somewhat in excess of 100,000.\(^8\) Still, this figure is based upon the slimmest of foundations but it is sufficient to note that the Jews formed a substantial minority within the Alexandrian and Egyptian populations.

The persecution and inter-communal violence seems to have been partly caused by the closeness and the partial integration of the two communities which is illustrated by the case of Helenos son of Tryphon, a Jew of Alexandria.\(^9\)
Both of his names are Greek and if the draft petition had not replaced "Alexandrian citizen" with "Alexandrian Jew", we would have had no way of establishing the petitioner's religious origins. Helenos had been educated as an ephebe in the gymnasion of Alexandria and had lived in the town all his life. Suddenly, he was liable to pay poll tax. This petition was, of course, an attempt to avoid this payment and everything that Helenos says must be treated with a certain caution. Helenos had been brought up as a Greek citizen of Alexandria and there does not seem to have been, in his eyes, any conflict between his Greek education and his Jewish ethnic origin. He seems to have regarded himself as an Alexandrian citizen who had a right to the same sorts of privilege that the ordinary Greek Alexandrians had, whilst these Alexandrians wished to defend their rights against the "outsiders". There is a clear tension between Jewish and Alexandrian statuses which we will explore below. This incident, dated between 7 B.C. and 4 B.C., indicates not only the tensions in the city but also the cultural links between the two groups.

Our source for the early disturbances in the Roman period is the Jewish philosopher-historian Philo who published two short works on the disturbances. One is an attack on the Prefect at the time of the troubles, Flaccus, the other is an account of the experiences of the delegation
sent to Rome to put the Jewish case before the Emperor Gaius. Both these accounts seem to be written with the same purpose in mind: to show the punishment awaiting those who persecuted God's chosen people. The tension between the communities was brought to a head by the arrival of Agrippa in Alexandria on his way back to his Kingdom from Gaius's court. Although Agrippa himself seems to have wanted not to publicise his visit, the Jewish community seems to have used the opportunity to process through the streets of Alexandria. The situation escalated when the Alexandrians staged a mock procession with an idiot, Karabas, taking the place of the King. Flaccus, although informed of these activities refused to intervene, and the result was a pogrom, involving the desecration of synagogues and the public beating of the members of the Jewish gerousia. Following the arrest of the prefect at the instigation of Agrippa, the disturbances seem to have continued and Philo was despatched to Rome with a delegation of prominent Jews to put their case before the Emperor. The account of the interviews with the Emperor concentrate on the eccentric behaviour of Gaius and his appalling decision to send the governor of Syria with a colossal imperial portrait to the Temple in Jerusalem. The Jews were saved from this fate by the delaying tactics of Petronius, the governor, the diplomacy of Agrippa, and, ultimately, the death of Gaius. The problem of the status of the Jews of Alexandria had not,
however, been solved, only shelved in the face of the threat of the general conflagration that the desecration of the Temple would have caused. We do not have an account of Philo for the subsequent disturbances and we are dependent upon Josephus but it seems that the Jews, who had been portrayed as pacific in Philo's account, rose up against the Alexandrians in a conflict which caused the intervention of the prefect.\textsuperscript{13} We also have the subsequent letter from the new Emperor, Claudius, to the Alexandrians resolving the dispute and attempting to bring peace to the city.

After the disturbances of 38-41, we hear nothing more of inter-communal violence until A.D. 66. Then, in the disturbances associated with the outbreak of the conflict in Judaea, there was rioting in Alexandria. The Jews could not be stopped and the Alexandrians were unable to defend themselves. Tiberius Julius Alexander sent in the legions who looted and destroyed until withdrawn.\textsuperscript{14} After the defeat of the Judaean Jews, action was taken against the Temple of Onias in Egypt which might have been developing as a centre for disaffected elements fleeing from Judaea. The temple was destroyed and the Jewish community of Egypt handed over any Jew they suspected of having been one of the sicarii to the Roman authorities.\textsuperscript{15}
The next major incident was the revolt of 115/6-117. After this date we here virtually nothing of the Jewish community in Egypt. The literary sources link the revolt to Cyrene. "In the eighteenth year of Trajan the Jews of Alexandria, Cyrene and Egypt rose up and in the next year caused a large war when Lupus was Prefect of all Egypt. In the first battle the Jews were victorious but the retreating Greeks fell upon the Jews of Alexandria and killed them all." 16 This was the last occasion when the Jews of Alexandria troubled the historians and the crushing of the revolt seems to have ended the political power of the community.

Under Hadrian, after the suppression of the Jewish revolt, there are two references to disturbances within Alexandria. Both references are very brief. The Historia Augusta tells us that while Hadrian was in the Northern provinces news reached him of a major disturbance in Alexandria. The trouble concerned the place of residence of an Apis bull since the Egyptians had been without one in either Memphis or Alexandria for several years. The date of the affair appears to be 122-3. 17 Dio tells us that Hadrian sent a letter to Alexandria to stop a disturbance and the letter succeeded in this aim. 18 It is tempting to connect these two reports especially as the Dio is epitomated and of uncertain date. It seems to be reasonably likely that
Hadrian adjudicated on the issue of the Apis bull, a decision that was treated as final by the Egyptians and thus the rioting stopped. A more problematic second-century reference comes from the work of John Malalas. He reports that Antoninus Pius began a campaign against the Egyptians who had rebelled and killed the Augustalios Deinarchos. The passage is obviously difficult to interpret since John was not terribly well informed about Egyptian matters in other parts of the narrative and the account of the killing of this official, who must surely represent the prefect, does not appear in any other source. There is a little backing to be found for this disturbance in the edict of Sempronius Liberalis, but the vague disturbances mentioned by Liberalis do not suggest the death of a prefect or the full scale war envisaged by John.19

The next major disturbance in Alexandria in the period under consideration was the assault on the city by the Emperor Caracalla in 215. Caracalla approached Alexandria with his army but after all the leading men had left the city to meet him on the road, as was the custom when the Emperor or other important person came to visit, he welcomed them all into his camp. Only when he reached the city was this impression of cordiality dispelled. Caracalla set the troops on the city and retired to the Serapeum to commune with the gods. Many of the leading citizens were killed and
Dio is able to draw the ironic parallel between the *pius* Caracalla sacrificing in the Serapeum of Alexandria and the actions outside in the city where human blood was being spilt for the tyrant. Outsiders and foreigners were expelled from the city and the preservation of the edict of expulsion in the papyrological evidence makes it clear that the edict was mainly aimed at the Egyptians of the *chora*. The city itself was divided by a cross-wall to prevent freedom of movement and was patrolled by soldiers of the guard. All the public messes were abolished as were the games and processions. The ceremonial of Greek civic life was ended. The purpose behind the attack, as it appears in Dio's account, seems to be almost purely malice. The Alexandrians had been too fond of Caracalla's brother Geta and too eager to condemn his death. The vengeance of the Emperor for this insult was swift and bloody. Dio prefaces his account of the assault on the city with an account of the actions of a favourite of Caracalla's which included the murder of Flavius Titianus the procurator at Alexandria. Three years later there was an outbreak of violence at Alexandria between the troops and the civilian population as to which contender to the throne to support. There was large scale bloodshed with both troops and civilians being killed. The situation became so serious that the Prefect Basilianus had to flee the country. Although these are quite separate incidents in the narrative of Dio, it is quite tempting to
connect all three episodes. The death of the outspoken Titianus at the hands of the favourite may be symptomatic of the worsening position of Caracalla vis-a-vis the Roman political elite which would give rise to threats to the Emperor's position, conspiracies, and an atmosphere of heightened tension. Titianus's position in Alexandria gave him a potential power base. A deeper reason for discontent of the Alexandrians might be suggested by the actions that Caracalla took to restore the situation following the massacre. The Baebius Iunani decree against bandits suggests serious problems in the whole of Egypt which would probably have led to an increase in the population of the city. Caracalla sought to end the process by expelling these Egyptians. If there was an economic recession within Egypt, the discontent amongst the Egyptians and the Alexandrians can be seen to have deeper roots than just moral indignation at the fratricide in the imperial family and the troubles in the next years suggest that the expulsions under Caracalla did not restore order.

Before we can hope to understand the actions of the Roman army, we must try to come to some conclusions about the nature of the problems facing the Romans in Alexandria. The outbreak of inter-communal violence in 38 is the first such outbreak we know of, although the tensions between the two communities may have been bubbling under the surface for
some considerable time. Josephus claims that the privileges that the Jews enjoyed were those of virtual equality with the Greeks within the same city. These rights had been confirmed by the Romans. The impression given by Claudius's letter to the Alexandrians is that he was restoring the status quo ante bellum. The actual provisions of the settlement may be reduced to a number of key terms:

1. The Alexandrians must not attack the Jews who are part of the city.

2. They must respect the Jews' religion and allow the free practice of that religion. In doing this, the situation is restored to that confirmed by Augustus.

3. The Jews are not to extend their influence or to intrude on Greek matters such as the games of the kosmetai or the gymnasiarchoi. This probably meant that the Jews were not allowed to enrol as ephebes.

4. The Jews must not increase their numbers by encouraging the Jews of Syria or the Jews of Egypt to join them.

In effect, each of the groups were to keep to their own. This kind of solution should, it could be thought, have
pleased the Greeks and have solved their problems since the Jews were formally held to be separate from them. They were citizens of Jewish Alexandria, governed by their own council of elders and presumably enjoying similar privileges in relation to the chora as the Greek citizens but were not of the same status as the Greeks. In spite of this judgement, Claudius clearly had the reputation, amongst the Greek community at least, of being a philo-semite. The fragmentary remains we have of what purports to be an account of an exchange between Claudius and the demagogue Isidoros culminates in an exchange of insults between the two. Isidoros accuses the Emperor of being biased towards the Jews and proceeds to call him "The cast-off son of the Jewess Salome". At which point the discussion is terminated by the execution of the Alexandrian. Other martyr acts seem to follow a very similar pattern. The important Alexandrian presents his people's case in front of an emperor who was heavily influenced by the Jews, the debate degenerates into a slanging match between the Alexandrian and the emperor and then the Alexandrian is executed. One of the emperors treated in this way is Hadrian who had a very poor record in maintaining friendly relations with the Jewish communities within the Empire. Dating these documents is very difficult since as works of fiction their dramatic date might bear little resemblance to their date of composition, nor is it clear whether the "martyrdoms"
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actually occurred. The Isidoros who appeared before Claudius may be the same man who was the prime mover in the disturbances under Flaccus but Isidoros is a common name and the existence of a historical Isidoros does not mean that his death was at the hands of the Emperor. The importance of the documents is that they portray the imperial house, and, by implication, the administration as well, as the protector of the Jews. To try and relate these literary works to specific outbreaks of anti-semitism is to tread on dangerous ground and we are much safer to read them as indicative of a general attitude rather than a particular incident.

The picture of Alexandrian civic life which we can draw from Josephus confirms the existence of this climate of violence and hatred. The disturbances which were to turn into the full scale rebellion in Judaea increased the political tensions in the rest of the Eastern Mediterranean and led to an escalation of the troubles in Alexandria. The Greeks were meeting to consider a motion to send an embassy to Nero when the Jews entered the amphitheatre. This sparked off the riot.27 There is no suggestion in Josephus that the Jews were not allowed to attend such public meetings but then as a Jewish writer we might expect Josephus to write in support of the Alexandrian Jews. The letter of Claudius only debarred the Jews from Gymnasial events and makes no mention of other gatherings. Jews, since they were not full
Alexandrian citizens, would not have been allowed to attend an ekklesia but the evidence suggests that such a formally constituted body did not exist and this gathering was a general political gathering. The passage seems to suggest that the Jews were legitimately and openly attending a public meeting. The communities were not so polarised that all meetings were closed to the other group and there was still a large measure of political integration.

In dealing with the end of the Jewish War, Josephus again turns his attention to the situation in Egypt. The militancy of the sicarii of Judaea had spread to Alexandria and there was confusion and turmoil within the Jewish community. This was ended by the actions of the council of elders who expelled the militant elements, handing them over to the Roman authorities. The violence within the community, the continual urge to revolt brought the council into action. They gave up their own rather face the wrath of the Romans. The trouble spread to the chora and culminated in the closure of the Temple of Onias. This incident appears as an almost entirely Jewish affair, only prompting Roman action with the closure of the temple. The Greek community do not seem to have been involved at all, yet the dramatic assertion of the authority of the elders in expelling the trouble makers, the initial successes of the agitators and the threat of the ruin of the community if the Romans
were to intervene suggests perhaps that the community was neither stable nor secure.

The picture that emerges from the papyrological material and the accounts of Josephus and Philo is difficult but, I think, ultimately comprehensible. The letter of Claudius reinforces the distinction between the Jews of Alexandria and those of elsewhere: a particularly significant move in the light of the relatively recent visit of Agrippa which had sparked off the first round of the disturbances. They possessed a special status as Alexandrian Jews. These privileges were not granted to all the Jews of Egypt. The periodic violence did not stop the Jews being an important part of the community or trying to continue as a more or less fully integrated part of that community. However, the major outbreaks of violence reflect an underlying current of inter-communal strife. The situation had a veneer of normality but was inherently unstable so that the news of the revolt of Judaea, the death of Gaius, or even the arrival of Agrippa could cause major outbreaks of violence.

The final conflict took place c. 116. All the literary accounts stress that the revolt started in Cyrene and spread to the East. There is, in fact, some doubt over the actual role of the Alexandrian Jews in the whole disturbance.
According to Eusebius, the Cyrenaican Jews advanced upon Alexandria in the hope of joining forces with the Alexandrians but, having defeated the Roman forces, were unable to take the city and the Jewish population were massacred. Orosius similarly divides the troubles in Egypt from those that took place in Alexandria. The Alexandrians fought a battle but were defeated. The major disturbances took place in Cyrene, the Thebaid and Lower Egypt. The inference is that the revolt did not succeed in Alexandria. The fate of the Alexandrian community is not in doubt. The retreating Romans fell upon the community. The rabbinic sources note the destruction of the main synagogue. There is some archaeological evidence of repairs at the Serapeum in Alexandria but the association of Hadrian with these repairs may not be related to any destruction of the temple during the revolt. This division between the Alexandrians and their co-religionists perhaps explains an edict of the prefect, which would most easily be dated to 115, reproving the Alexandrians for attacking the Jews of the city. The prefect states that there was no justification for the action, especially since the Romans had defeated the Jews in battle. This seems to be an edict attempting to restore order in Alexandria and does not suggest that there was a serious Jewish revolt taking place throughout Egypt. The situation was under control. Eusebius dates the outbreak of the troubles to 115 but the
war to 116 and this allows us to date this disturbance to a period before the major revolt. The disturbances then form part of a wave of unrest running from the recently conquered areas of Mesopotamia to Cyrene. The comparative lack of action of the Alexandrian Jews in 116 was because their revolt had already been suppressed. The culmination of this wave of unrest was the destruction of the Jewish community of Alexandria.

The troubles of the Jewish element of the population illuminate for us the function of the Roman army but before considering in more detail just what these events can tell us about the army, it is necessary to sound a note of caution. The information we have about the Jews comes to us through early Christian writers and through the Jewish writers of the period, Philo and Josephus. The interest of early Christians in the Jews has meant that we have a disproportionate amount of information on this community. To judge from the literary evidence, the major threat to the peace and security of Roman Egypt in the first century came from the Jewish-Alexandrian conflicts. Such a conclusion would be ill-founded. The most important, literate and sophisticated part of the Jewish community lived in Alexandria. We must beware of generalising from Alexandria and we should be aware that the situation as described by our partial sources refers specifically to Alexandria. Philo
attacks Flaccus over his dealings with the Jews of Alexandria because that is his main interest as an Alexandrian Jew, not because the policy adopted towards the Jews of Alexandria was the most important aspect of the Roman political and military administration.

The most obvious initial observation about Philo’s account of the disturbances of 38 is that the army does not play the major role in events. Indeed, the army appears three times in the Egyptian narrative. Firstly, Flaccus is praised for his energy in training and disciplining the troops. Secondly, a centurion and some troops disarm the Jews and finally, a centurion arrests Flaccus on the orders of Gaius. The relative absence of the army from the account may be seen as being the result of the inertia of the prefect which Philo criticises. The obvious inference is that it was the duty of the prefect to intervene when the procession exalting Karabas insulted the friend and ally of the emperor. The prefect was obviously supposed to have stopped the disturbance at this stage. The disturbance of 41 was put down by the prefect. We have a fuller account of the actions taken in 66 against the rioters. The prefect Tiberius Julius Alexander used his personal contacts with the Jewish leaders to try and calm the situation, but when this move was rebuffed he ordered his two legions and 2,000
troops who had been transferred to Alexandria from Libya to attack the Jewish area.

The actual use of the army to search the Jewish districts in 38 is instructive. The centurion and his men caused a great disturbance within the district by searching the houses and penetrating into the women's quarters but it also seems to be the case that the mere presence of Roman soldiers in the district was a cause for some concern and that the use of the military was, in some way, also an abuse of the prefect's power that could only be justified in extraordinary circumstances. The disarming of the Egyptians, also carried out by Flaccus, was justified since the Egyptians had often revolted but the Jews, according to Philo, were a peace-loving nation. Even allowing for the rhetorical excesses of Philo's account, it is clear that the intrusion of the soldiers was bitterly resented.

Caracalla's actions within Alexandria to punish the citizens are of some interest. The building of the cross wall, the patrolling of the streets by soldiers, the banning of games and the communal meals are significant. The "spectacles" of the Greek city-state were what connected that city with its past, what gave the city its communal spirit. By enforcing these rules, Caracalla was banning what made the city more than a large town, what gave the city its
(Greek) corporate identity. The building of a cross-wall within the city to divide the city internally made one place into two. Significantly, this destruction of the corporate identity of the city meant the introduction of troops into the city to fulfil the functions of a policing force. The destruction of the city by these manoeuvres is to be contrasted by the expulsion of all unnecessary outsiders from the city. Caracalla, in this decree increased the status of the city by reaffirming its exclusivity. This is not, however, a paradox. By purging the city, both by violence and by the decree, Caracalla could claim to restore the city to its old position, to restore the Greek city and rescue it from the threat of being overwhelmed by the Egyptians. Caracalla first destroyed and then refounded the city.\(^{38}\)

It seems clear from this that the troops were not part of the normal law enforcement agencies in ancient Alexandria and they only intervened in unusual circumstances. As far as we can tell from these sources, Alexandria was a city without a large military peace keeping force. Philo did not feel that the use of troops to search the Jewish quarter for weapons was in any way justified. The military violence could only be used when there was a major threat to civil order and the Jews patently did not constitute that threat as was shown by the dramatic contrast between the arms
produced by the similar measures in the chora and the poor haul from the Jewish houses. For Philo, it was another attack on the rights and privileges of his community.

The evidence from this period points to civic violence in Alexandria on quite a large scale. We know quite a lot about the major outbreaks of violence and the Acts of the Pagan Martyrs suggests that there was a continual undercurrent of hostility which we might expect to be reflected in regular, small scale acts of violence. The sources from the city are particularly good because of certain religious factors and we cannot assume that Alexandria was unusually violent or prone to disturbance, although it is true that the Alexandrians do seem to have had a reputation for unruliness. The large number of Jews in the population, the problems with antisemitism and other cultural hostilities could probably be paralleled in many other areas of the Eastern Roman empire. Alexandria had a large legionary base nearby at Nikopolis which is normally assumed to have been placed there in order to keep control over the city. If this was so, then Roman policy failed. On several occasions control of the city was lost. The achievement of Petronius in holding off the large mob of stone-throwing Alexandrians with only his bodyguard is significant in that he was reliant on his bodyguard and not a legionary presence within the city. The legions do not
appear to be actively involved in the policing of the city and only intervened when the civil disturbances had escalated into war-like situations. We must assume that under normal circumstances the Greek city, like every other Greek city in the Empire, organised its own policing. The intervention in the Jewish district and Caracalla's actions in introducing the military as a policing force can be seen in their true light. They were acts full of political significance. It would, however, be perverse to say that there was no army presence in Alexandria. Troops formed the bodyguard of the prefect and would be passing through the city continually in performance of their duties but they were not the police force of Alexandria.

The army, then, only intervened in large numbers in Alexandria when the situation was out of control. The Prefect called upon them as a last resort. They usually arrived in overwhelming numbers, were extremely violent and then were withdrawn. The general impression of large scale military intervention is similar to that we get from the major revolts in the chora that we will look at in the next chapter, though there are important differences. Military involvement in the affairs of the city was an abnormal event but, in the violent disruptions of the first century, not infrequent.
VI
Bandits and Rebels

The study of the actions and the role of the Roman army within Egypt presents certain methodological problems since the papyrological evidence carries with it certain biases of subject and place that mean that actual historical events are hardly ever reflected in the documentation. The nature of the material means that we know a lot about individual incidents, often of only local or personal significance, but we are unable to assess the impact of major historical events. The piecemeal effect of the papyrological evidence means that our knowledge of the role of any institution may also be piecemeal and, as the subject matter of the papyri are far from random, selected aspects of the institution might slip past the historian, however careful the analysis of the material might be. Our understanding of the role of those soldiers when they performed those duties must depend upon our assumptions as to the context into which they were sent. Yet to establish a specific historical context using the papyrological material is notoriously difficult. Although the literary material also presents many difficult problems, it is possible, on rare occasions, to combine literary evidence with papyrological material in order to solve the problems
inherent in each form of the source material and to create a study which illuminates the history of the army and also the history of the region.

The great revolt of 115-117 is not so well served by the ancient sources as the earlier problems in Alexandria. In the great revolt of 115-117, there are clear links between the episodes in Egypt and the Cyrenaican Jewish community. Josephus mentions this community immediately after his account of the troubles with the sicarii in Egypt in an episode to be dated to the early 70s. Cyrenaica also was "infected" by the sicarii and a messianic movement started up under the leadership of Jonathan the weaver. This desert-bound group was easily defeated by the governor Catullus who then persecuted several prominent Jewish leaders before, like Flaccus, he was reported to the authorities and removed from his post. Josephus seems to have suffered in this persecution. In spite of this, the archaeological and epigraphic evidence shows that the Cyrenaican community was powerful and flourishing in the first century. There are inscriptions from the community honouring benefactors of the city, not just the community, and lists of benefactors of the synagogue suggest that the donors are thoroughly hellenised members of the wider community. It was, however, from here that the impetus for the great revolt came. It is unfortunate that we have very
little material on the revolt to enable us to assess its nature. Possibly, with Trajan campaigning in the East, threatening the end of the Parthian Empire and the large, destructive earthquake in Antioch the previous year, a feeling of götterdämmerung spread through the East, giving rise to messianic movements, the clearest sign of religious or social distress within the Jewish communities, spreading from the Mesopotamian communities and finding a ready ear in the western diaspora.

The reports of the literary sources are brief. Eusebius tells us that "In the eighteenth year of Trajan the Jews of Alexandria, Cyrene and Egypt rose up and in the next year caused a large war when Lupus was Prefect of all Egypt. In the first battle the Jews were victorious but the retreating Greeks fell upon the Jews of Alexandria and killed them all. The Cyrene Jews, deprived of their allies, fell upon the coun of Egypt and laid waste the nomes led by Loukouas. Against these the emperor sent Marcus Turbo with foot and fleet and also cavalry. These men, in many battles and over a long period of time, slew many thousands of Jews, not only those from Cyrene but also those from Egypt who had taken up with them together with their King Loukouas." Cassius Dio details the savagery of the revolt: "Also, at this time, the Jews of Cyrene appointed Andreas as their leader and killed both Romans and Greeks, eating the flesh
of their victims and making belts with their entrails. They anointed themselves with blood and wore skins for clothing. Many were sawed in two, from the head downwards; others they gave to the beasts."4 Orosius writing about the events of the reign of Trajan saw fit to devote most of his narrative for those years to the events in Cyrenaica: "At once, it is incredible to say, the Jews, as if afflicted by madness, rose up in different parts of the world and fought a most terrible war against the natives throughout the whole of Libya which was so damaged, and so many farmers killed, that if Hadrian had not collected and placed there colonies, the land would have remained desert, cleared of habitation."5 Appian was in Egypt at the time of the revolt and this personal experience emerges when discussing Caesar's arrangements for the body of Pompey which was placed in a temple of Nemesis. This temple was destroyed in the uprising, "when Trajan was destroying the Jewish race in Egypt".6 Appian, himself, had a fortunate escape from Pelusium just before the Jews established control over the waterways.7

The widespread destruction in Cyrenaica is well attested. Cyrene itself seems to have been extensively rebuilt during the second century and some of the work was specifically associated with the tumultus Judaicus. The main Cyrene-Apollonia road was destroyed in the conflict and
rebuilt in 119. Damage due to the revolt caused repair work to be done at the temple of Hecate. The temple of Apollo was also damaged in some way. The large scale destruction in Cyrenaica obviously encouraged a building programme. Hadrian resettled the area in order to revitalise the communities. There is a temptation to associate all the building and rebuilding of the mid second century to imperial beneficence due to the Jewish revolt but the generosity of Hadrian towards the cities of the empire is famous and a certain amount of the work may have been the gradual improvement or the repair of the cities. However, there can be no doubt that the revolt was a major and destructive event in the history of Cyrenaica.

We have papyrological evidence for the scale of the revolt in the enora. There is evidence of damage in the Fayum during the revolt. Damage occurred in the Lykopolite nome and in the Oxyrhynchite where the population were still celebrating the victory over the Jews eighty-three years later. The Hermopolite nome was also attacked. The disappearance of the Jewish community at Edfu after 116 is probably to be connected with the revolt. The military effort against the Jews is illuminated by an archive belonging to the strategos Apollonios. The situation is a little confused since it is difficult to arrange the documents in any kind of chronological order. The only dates
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in the sequence refer to months and not to years. One document from September urges Apollonios to follow the example of the strategos of the Hermopolite who went nowhere without a strong guard, looking to his personal safety before all else. Another letter urges him not to let the rebels roast him, recalling the horror stories in Dio's account. A fragmentary letter actually describes the course of a battle somewhere to the south of Memphis. The Roman forces, probably a legionary group, had been defeated and the one hope left was a force of villagers conscripted from the surrounding area, but these too were defeated by the Jews with heavy losses. The writer, possibly Apollonios, did not despair since he had news of the arrival of another legion of Autilius at Memphis. Another letter from the archive deals with private business in a rather cryptic fashion. The letter does inform the recipient of the local gossip: if the troops moved up in sufficient numbers the basilikoi [eorgoi] would be moved by Apion. The appearance of these "royal farmers" in a military context is surprising as they only appear to be a group of villagers who farm a particular type of land and nearly all the references to them come from the Ptolemaic period. It is possible that the restoration is incorrect. The next letter shifts the scene to Memphis. Servants of Apollonios rejoice at the news of their master's success at Memphis and the victory of the Roman forces. In the aftermath of the revolt, another
DAMAGED TEXT IN ORIGINAL
letter from the archive complains of the difficulties and the dangers of travelling through the chora between Alexandria and Hermopolis. Throughout these letters the Jews are called "impious".

The evidence gives a vivid picture of the troubles. The rebels spread destruction from the Delta region, though failing to capture Alexandria, to Middle and Upper Egypt. Their progress appears to have been uncontrolled. Appian's escape from Pelusium before the arrival of the rebels does not suggest that there was to be any organised resistance and the tactical situation following the defeat of the Roman forces and their retreat to Alexandria suggests that the chora was left open to the rebels. The resistance from the authorities gradually gathered strength but the Egyptian garrison was unable to deal with the problem and forces were despatched by Trajan. Eusebius stresses the difficulties of the campaigning and the papyrological evidence points to defeats suffered by the Roman forces. Indeed, after the defeat of the Romans mentioned by Apollonius and the defeat of the levied forces, the situation appeared to be desperate with the Jews controlling the field. The situation was only saved by the arrival at Memphis of the Roman legion.

The rebels proved more than a match for the highly professional legions of ancient and modern legend even when
supplemented by local levies. Apollonius seems to have been in charge of some forces and to have had to secure the nome of Apollinopolis-Heptakomias in Upper Egypt in which he served. Troops were probably commanded by the *strateoi* of the nomes, officials whose original military role was subsumed under their civil responsibilities.

The revolt of the *Boukolia* in 171-2 offers the historian similar opportunities to combine literary and papyrological information. The major historical source on this event is Cassius Dio whose account reads: "And those called the *Boukoloi* created a revolt in Egypt and joined with the other Egyptians led by a priest Isidore. First, dressed as women, they tricked the Roman centurion, since they seemed to be the women of the *Boukoloi* approaching to give him money on behalf of the men, and struck him down. They sacrificed his companion, swearing an oath on the entrails and then eating them. Of these men, Isidore was the bravest of all. Then, when they conquered those Romans in Egypt in a full battle, they advanced nearly to Alexandria and would have got there if Cassius had not been sent against them from Syria and contrived to upset their unity, dividing them from each other, since, because of their desperation and numbers, he did not dare to come against them all and so he subdued them as they divided."24
The revolt is also mentioned in the biography of Marcus Antoninus: "And when the soldiers of the Bucolici did many terrible things throughout Egypt, they were put down by Avidius Cassius". The *scriptores* give no new information but rather act to confirm the reference from Dio and it is this reference which contains several rather unusual elements that have caused some comment which must be looked at later.

The papyrological record concerning this revolt mainly consists of a tax roll from Tamouis. This roll is a summary of the cash dues of villages in the Hermesian nome, drawn up for the prefect Calvisius Statianus. The entries detail the history of the debts accumulated by the tax payers of individual villages and, since taxation was dependent to a certain extent upon population, details the demographic changes effecting the area. The *konomatarius* of Hermopolis reported that the village had had a population of 150 men and 100 artabas of grain were imposed upon the village. The population had fallen to 45, then to 34, then to 11, before a moratorium was declared in 168/9. Similar catastrophic depopulations occurred in other villages in the area. Psenatore's population fell from 319 in 131/2 to 39 in 159/60, to 10, to 3 to 2. Psen[..] was deserted having had a population of 52. The villages of Petetei, Psenharpokratis, Psenbiancanou and Kerkenouphis were
similarly depopulated by 163/9. Psobthon-Haruoteos' population fell to 2 in 166/7 who both fled. The numbers of fishermen at Zmoumis fell from 31 to 5 in 167/8. Eku had had a numerous population but by 167/8 was reduced to 2 tax payers. Neblammis suffered a massive fall in population and was deserted by 166/7. The population seems to have been in decline through the 160s, culminating in this rash of reports of depopulation in the late 160s and early 170s. The numbers refer to adult male tax payers only and there may have been a residual non tax-paying population but the decline in the population over a considerable period of time points to deep-seated problems in the area. The roll is only a summary of the reports submitted to the district authorities but sometimes does detail the causes of depopulation. The village of Petetei had been in some way "involved in the recent troubles" and was attacked by a detachment of soldiers who killed all the men there and the villagers of Psenharpokrates and Psenbiencionou who were staying in the village. The komocrammateus reported on the village of Kerkenouphis reporting that the majority of the inhabitants of the village had been killed by the "impious Nikocnites" who had attacked the village and burnt it. Others were killed by the plague and the few remaining fled. Zmoumis was also attacked by the "impious Nikocnites" about whom a report was written by Morion the strategos and Quadratus the centurion. The Nikocnites were the Boukoloi.
The picture that can be drawn from this complicated document is of a gradual demographic and economic decline which resulted in growing social unrest and violence. The unrest resulted in some kind of rebellious activity on the part of these Nikochites which was reported to the Prefect. The result of this was the despatch of a troop of soldiers who rooted out the rebel sympathisers in a drastic manner. The population's situation, caught between the rebels and the authorities both of whom seem to have been destructive, is reminiscent of more modern policies of violent repression by foreign powers and must have exasperated an already difficult situation. Yet these difficulties were recognised by the Roman authorities by reductions in the tax burden, inadequate though these measures were. However, in 172/3, Statianus started to look for payment of the arrears. This seems to be extraordinary in the circumstances but Statianus may have felt that the situation required a firm hand. Disappearances were a regular part of Egyptian village life and a recognised form of tax evasion. It is possible that the administration felt that the social problems were not as great as was suggested by the returns of the officials or that the military intervention had restored the situation and people would return home. A direct causal relationship between this decision and the major outbreak of violence in 172/3 would be appealing.
The rebellious Boukoloi appear in several literary sources not of the type normally used by historians for reliable information. Achilles Tatius, like many of the other Greek novelists, set his story of Leucippe and Clitophon against a background of rampant piracy and banditry. The action moves through innumerable twists and turns until the hero and his beloved are deposited, following the inevitable shipwreck, on the coast of Egypt, a coast line "wholly infested with robbers". The party are captured by these robbers who are Boukoloi and led by a Basileus who had no Greek. All seems lost but rescue is at hand in the shape of the forces of law and order. A small detachment of fifty men arrives and surprises the bandits, rescuing the hero but not the heroine. This separation of hero and heroine allows the hero to witness the campaign against the Boukoloi from the Roman camp, for now a larger army arrived to face the enemy: "On the next day, he (the general) made preparations to fill up and so to cross the trench which stood in our way; for on the other side of it we could see the robbers standing in great numbers and fully armed; they had an improvised altar made of mud and a coffin nearby it. Then two of them led up the girl with her hands tied behind her back. I (Clitophon) could not see who they were as they were in full armour, but I recognised Leucippe. First they poured libations over her head and then led her round the altar while, to the accompaniment of a pipe, a priest
chanted what seemed to be an Egyptian hymn; this was at least what was indicated by the movement of his lips and the contortions of his features. Then, at a concerted signal, all retired some distance from the altar; one of the young attendants laid her down on her back and strapped her so by means of pegs fixed in the ground, just as the statues represent Marsyas fixed to the tree; then he took a sword and plunging it in about the heart drew it down to the lower part of the belly, opening up the body. Her bowels gushed forth and these they drew forth in their hands and placed them upon the altar; and when they were roasted, the whole body of them cut then up into small pieces, divided into shares and ate them. The general, who will turn out not to be the saviour he initially appears, decided to wait further reinforcements for he had only 5,000 men facing the rebels. Eventually, the reinforcements arrived and the general marched out, but the rebels, by a clever stratagem, lured the Roman troops into marshy ground and there ambushed them, thus defeating the Roman forces. Soon after this, order is restored in a fresh battle and the Boukoloi are defeated.

Heliodorus's novel Aithiopika also plunged the heroine into mortal danger at the hands of Egyptian bandits from the Boukolia who swarmed over a ship. The bandits are land based and the picture drawn in the opening sequences of the novel
shows a river bank littered with bodies. Heliodoros's bandits were led by an Egyptian speaker who could not communicate with the hero and heroine. The city of the Boukoloi was a marsh city in a lake, the city of Nikochis.

The Boukoloi also make a brief appearance in the account of pre-Alexander Alexandria in Strabo. "Anakotis, now in the city of Alexandria, the district above the shipyards, was then a village. They gave the district around the village to the Boukoloi who were able to keep out any outsiders". The ferocity of the Boukoloi and their xenophobia were obviously well-established within the folklore of Egypt. Saint Jerome mentions the Boukoloi in his life of Hilarion: Hilarion "when he returned, wishing to sail again to Egypt, that is to that place which is called the Bacolia, where no-one is a Christian but the people are ferocious barbarians, he persuaded them to allow him to ascend to the great lake itself in its secret location". The Boukoloi maintained their ferocious reputation.

These texts are problematic for obvious reasons. The novelist were producing fictional, fantastic writing which requires caution in turning into historical sources. Before considering these difficulties we must try and establish the basic context for the study of this group. I intend to consider the geographical situation of the people.
We are largely ignorant of the social and political make-up of the Delta region in all periods of ancient history. Literary sources tended to concentrate on the city of Alexandria and the more dramatic sites of the Fayum and Upper Egypt. The papyrological evidence on the Delta is also slight. The area was too damp to preserve the documentation. (The Thmouis rolls were carbonized.) However, on occasion a document relevant to the history of the Delta is transported to another region and there preserved. One of these documents, a list of hay receipts from the ala veterana Gallica, conserves the stations of the horsemen despatched from the unit. Fourteen of the fifty-eight soldiers despatched were sent to the Boukolia in A.D. 179. The range of stations of the unit stretches from Alysma, on the Red Sea, to the Arsinoite, to the environs of Alexandria. This is a considerable range of stations and only really places the Boukolia within the Delta region. A letter from about the same period was written by Ptolemaios to his brother informing him that he had been stationed in the Boukolia. Strabo is not a great help. He suggests that some of the Boukoloi were transferred into the area that was swallowed up by the growing city of Alexandria, a standard Pharaonic practice in dealing with security problems. Bützer writes of the Delta region: "the major part of the Predynastic Delta was by no means a marshy wasteland inhabited only by scattered pastoral communities...It is
nonetheless probable that settlements were far more dispersed than they were in Upper Egypt, that overall population density was significantly lower and that the northernmost one-third of the Delta was almost unpopulated in Old Kingdom times. "Pastoralism was an important part of the life of the region and this is shown by the continuing popularity of cattle cults in the area. 48 Butzer's portrayal of a damp, sparsely populated region fits with the picture of the region in Heliodoros. The capital of the Bouklooi, Nikochis, has not yet been identified but the distinctive qualities of the region are known. We may perhaps assume that such a region of pastoralism and difficult communications would have a rather loose political structure. The Romans seem to have a definite place in mind when discuss postings, perhaps Nikochis, but the range of the Bouklooi, in the novelistic material and probably in reality as well, was great, stretching across large swathes of the Delta. The political shape imposed upon the Egyptian countryside by the authorities, dividing the country up into nomes, does not necessarily bear any relationship to the human geography of the area. Such an informal division would not be represented in our official documentary material but in the unofficial letters and novels such human geographical divisions are of greater significance than the administrative.
I feel that the papyrological and the geographical information is sufficient to allow us to consider the literary texts with a certain caution. The novelists and the historian do seem to agree on some aspects of the rebellion and they cannot, on the basis of the context we have, be dismissed as merely manipulating certain topos within the literary tradition. The historicity of the second part of the account is not in doubt. All authorities agree on the initial defeat of the Roman forces, the seriousness of the rebellion, the arrival of support, though the novelists do not mention Avidius Cassius the governor of Syria, and a final, rather low-key end to the rebellion. The popularity of Avidius Cassius within Egypt has been surmised since Egypt, notably Alexandria, supported him in his attempt to usurp the throne. However, the actions of the Bouxoloi and the role of the centurion in the account of Dio have drawn some critical attention.

Ramsay MacMullen cast doubt on the role of the centurion and the narrative as a whole: "In fact, by the account of Dio, the trouble...began with a corrupt centurion who expected bribes for the release of conscripts or prisoners and whose murder committed the tribes to a wider revolt" and the whole incident was "a unique episode". The actions of the centurion do at first sight seem a little perverse, wandering in this area receiving money with only
one companion. MacMullen regarded the incident as extraordinary, partly because he was trying to demonstrate that there was no nationalism in Egypt. However, the evidence clearly points to the centurions being deployed throughout the chora to supervise and aid the local administration and to provide military aid if this was thought necessary. MacMullen's belief that the centurion was necessarily corrupt must be dismissed. For a centurion to be accompanying a tax collector or even to be receiving money as a governmental official, accompanied by a servant or a soldier or the equivalent was not unusual.

Yet, the real problems with this passage in Dio is not the historical context, which is substantially correct, but with the atrocities committed by the Boukoloi. It is this element which makes the entire account so difficult to believe and has drawn attention to the passage. The establishing of the historical context does not directly influence the suggestion that the events portrayed are essentially fictional. The audience would presumably know the historical context and an unbelievable context would have rendered the important element in the story, the sacrifice, incredible. But, having established that the context is indeed credible, we are forced to consider whether the dramatic stories can be regarded as credible versions of events.
There is now a substantial amount of anthropological discussion and literature on cannibalism and related issues. There is also a substantial literary tradition linking Egypt with cases of cannibalism but I do not intend to discuss this matter in detail.\textsuperscript{52} The story of cannibalism in Juvenal is by far the fullest report we have of such an incident. It is also a report that has a full commentary from the author. The incident occurred at a religious festival when one village taunted another by acting against the particular animal the village held to represent their own special deity. The symbolic violence escalated into brawling, into rioting, and further into armed conflict. One of the villagers fell and was torn apart and consumed by the inflamed crowd. Juvenal explicitly links the story of the atrocity to the religious feelings of the Egyptian peasantry who ridiculously worship the crocodile, the ibis, the baboon, fish, a dog and also vegetables.\textsuperscript{53} Other immorailties associated with the Egyptians and with this incident in particular are the extravagant length of their festivals and the excessive consumption of food and drink on these occasions. The contrasts drawn in the work with Romanising Western provincials points to the conclusion that Egyptians were too uncivilized to be counted amongst cultured nations and perversely were not trying to adopt the culture of Greece and Rome.\textsuperscript{54} There is an interesting comparison to be drawn between the portrayal of the Jewish
rebels and those of the Boukolia in Dio's account. The novelists were probably writing at the beginning of the third century and so were more or less contemporary with Dio.\textsuperscript{55} The truth behind these atrocities hardly matters for my purposes and is impossible to reach firm conclusions about but the widespread portrayal of Egyptians and Jewish rebels as uncivilized cannibals suggests that this belief was current in the immediate aftermath of the revolts and fitted with an image of the Egyptians current in Roman circles from prior to that point.
The behaviour of the Boukoloi and their representation in the literary sources brings us to the related area of banditry in Egypt. The Boukoloi were the archetypal bandits for the third-century Greek novelists but Egypt's reputation for such activities seems to have surpassed that of other areas in the second-century. Xenophon of Ephesus whose work is usually dated to the middle of the second century and thus before the revolt of the Boukolia, infested Egypt with bandits. His hero Habrocomes arrived in Egypt, possibly at one of the most Eastern mouths of the Nile, was captured by bandits and then taken to be sold at Pelusium. Xenophon's novel also details the story of another character, Hippothoos, who was of noble descent but fell upon hard times. Although Hippothoos eventually turns out to be a friend of the two lovers, his role changes in different parts of the work and at times he behaves in a very violent and savage manner. Hippothoos's reaction to his misfortune was to become a bandit. He collected a large band of men in Asia, invaded Syria, burning and looting any village he came to, and eventually, ended up in Egypt. After passing through the Delta, he retired to the desert caves around Koptos and supported himself and his band by attacking the traders coming from India or Aethiopia across the desert roads. This was a major operation with a gang of 500 men. Eventually, the activities of the gang came to the notice of the authorities under the governor (archon) but only after the
gang had started raiding Egyptian towns. There was a battle, from which Hippothoos escaped, and a campaign on the part of the authorities to remove all bandits from the country. 58

In this context, we can turn to look at the general representation of bandits in ancient fiction and history. Banditry is a popular topic in modern studies and the evidence has been collected by many authors. J. Winkler in his article "Lolliaius and the Desperadoes" has detailed the parallels to the Dio account in the novels. It is quite clear from the assembled evidence that bandits in the fictional and historical Roman world were associated with human sacrifice and with particularly horrible deaths. 59 Bandits were excluded from Graeco-Roman cultural norms. They were, to borrow a modern term, outlaws.

Bandits were a recurrent problem for the Roman authorities. The centurions in the nomes, to be examined in the next chapter, seem to have been especially interested in acts of violence, several of which look like more organised bandit activity than the small time violence which makes up the majority of the complaints. Acts against tax officials had connotations of banditry, not just of crime. They could be construed as being in some way politically conscious acts. People disappearing, robbers that come in the night and attack a whole household, robbery on the highway in
country areas, all look to be distinctive activities of bandits. The line between plain robbery and banditry is a thin one which the Greeks and Romans do not seem to have honoured semantically. Both were thieves. The evidence of banditry within Egypt is not that great. Most famously, there is the decree of M. Sempronius Liberalis who declared an amnesty for those who had left their homes in the recent disturbances which was to last for three months. He had sympathy for those who had left home because of liturgical commitments they could not fulfil or from some economic difficulties but those who had fled voluntarily to live by banditry were to be hunted down by the epistrate;oi, strate;oi, and by the soldiers as was everyone else at the end of the three months. This decree issued in 154, or a similar one, was still being publicised in 153. This shows the force that would be brought to bear on the bandits: a combination of the "military" and the "civilian". Iunius wrote to the strate;oi to encourage their efforts against the bandits in 205. Iunius wished to persuade the strate;oi that they should get to the root of the problem by hitting the supporters of the bandits. The war must be taken to the supporters who would then give the bandits up. A policy which seems to have been followed by authoritarian bandit hunters from all ages. Iunius's success, if he had any success, may have been short lived since there is a report to the scribe from third-century Soaonoaiou NesoS of
a night attack on the village by bandits. More dramatic is the small excerpt from an interrogation during a court case probably held at Antinoopolis in the third century. A confession extracted under torture implicating people from a certain village in an act of brigandage was being denied. More details emerge of the problems of law and order associated with the mobility of the population in times of distress from a complaint of 209. The complaint was addressed to the Prefect of Egypt and started with brief quotations from imperial decrees and a letter of the prefect Subatianus Aquila. Both edicts, promulgated after 193, are difficult to read but they seem to insist on the return of those who were living away from their homes. They should return because of the gifts given to Egypt by the most bountiful emperors and dire penalties are threatened for those who fail to return. The scope of governmental action was not limited to these miscreants alone but those who offered them shelter were to be fined HS 50,000 for each person sheltered. The fine was to be imposed by the epistratejoi. The prefect ordered that the decrees and his letter enforcing the decrees be publicised throughout Egypt. The specific complaint is against an individual whose name is lost. This person came from the Little Oasis and was at that time staying in the Oxyrhynchite. There he addressed public assemblies, although it was strictly forbidden for an outsider to do this, making inflammatory speeches. He had
also acted violently towards the petitioner and others, using his mobility and foreigness to avoid legal retribution, and built up a small gang whom he intimidated into following him. This small-time gangster acted as he did since his illegal, unregistered presence made him difficult to track down.65

The literary evidence is slight. Tacitus describes Egypt as "a difficult province, superstitious and immoral, and hence rebellious and unstable, not knowing laws or magistrates".66 Philo relates an incident from the prefecture of Flaccus. The centurion Bassus had been put in charge of the collection of the arms of the Egyptians. The policy had been so successful that the boats full of arms sailing down to Alexandria caused congestion. This story is told as a dramatic contrast to the lack of arms produced by the similar intrusion into the Jewish quarter. Philo says that this was unjustified since the Jews had never revolted but the Egyptians were always doing so.67 These first-century sources accuse the Egyptians of being disruptive and rebellious without citing specific examples. We might suspect that this action by Flaccus was in response to a specific incident rather than to the general disruption caused by brigandage and his training and exercise of the army upon arrival in the province might be related to such an event.68 Outside the chronological limits of my study,
Eusebius transmits the story of Dionysios, Bishop of Alexandria during the Decian persecution. The Bishop survived the persecution and was forced to account for this embarrassing fact. The story of his failure to be arrested despite all his best efforts has a certain comic irony. Having finally succeeded in finding some soldiers to arrest him, he was imprisoned by them at Taposiris. One of his party eluded capture and retired to a local wedding party, informing the peasants of events. The peasants were so enraged that they set out to rescue the unfortunate bishop. Bursting in on him and his captors, they chased the soldiers away. Dionysios was left imagining them to be bandits and pleading with them to allow him to be taken to his martyrdom or to be killed in the manner of a martyr. The literary sources suggest the prevalence of banditry in Egypt.

This gives rise to the question as to whether such unrest was part of the structure of Egyptian society. Sempronius Liberalis may have been dealing with the aftermath of a major disturbance when he issued his decree. The Ti. Iulius Alexander decree and the decree of Sosianus Aquila, concentrating on abuses by officials, may be part of programmes aimed at curing civil unrest at a time of tension. Although our first-century sources emphasise the violent reactions of the chora Egyptians, many of the sources had an interest in stressing the rebelliousness of
the country. The references from the second century and the documentary evidence of demographic disturbance suggest a greater level of civil unrest. This is partly due to the increased number of documents from the period but only partly so. On one level, the level of the language of the bureaucracy which did not distinguish between robbery and banditry, theft was part of the everyday problems of life and probably remained a constant problem. However, there must be a distinction between theft and the organised societies of violent thieves, bandits. Possibly the only workable definition that divides banditry from normal thievery is that of the number of people involved, a definition which seems to tacitly operate within the ancient material. The possible association of outbreaks of banditry with major uprisings, all except the Baebius Iunius decree, suggests that banditry was regarded as an unusual occurrence. The Baebius Iunius decree is the exception to the rule and, in a way, proves it. Iunius does not regard banditry as a problem that was impossible to solve. The familiarity of the policy to modern eyes, detaching the bandits from their community, and the justifiable confidence of the prefect that this method, properly carried out, will produce results, does not suggest that banditry was an intractable problem for ancient society. If Iunius thought that solving the problem was a possibility, as do the other prefects who seem to act on the issue, then it seems likely
that the problem was solvable. Xenophon of Ephesus suggests that when the authorities moved against the bandits, the bandits were defeated, dispersed, and driven out of the province.

All this evidence and discussion leads us to the question of the status of the bandit and into the heart of the modern debate about banditry. We must take account of the position of bandits within the ideology of the Roman cultural elite and of the vast amounts of modern comparative evidence collected since the field of bandit studies was more or less created by Eric Hobsbawm. Hobsbawm's principle creation which has caused so much furore was the "social bandit". The English equivalent is the mythologised figure of Robin Hood out many European societies have similar figures. These groups of men, usually led by an outstanding, almost invulnerable hero, are seen to embody peasant values and represent peasant culture against outside forces. In the majority of Hobsbawm's cases these external forces were the new forces of capitalism but that is rather a function of the period of his specialization. The main criticism of Hobsbawm's methodology has been his failure to distinguish accurately between mythic accounts of banditry and the reality of bandit activities. However, the really interesting aspect of social banditry is this mythologising of their position within the peasant context. Robin Hood's
activities are of little interest except for the fact that he came to be regarded as a hero for the performance of criminal activities. The "social bandit's" emergence can be seen as the fulfilment of the wishes of the peasantry to escape from the injustice and oppression that characterises their lives. The bandit is seen as escaping from the normal social order and it is within this structuralist model that the position of the bandit is interpreted. The association of bandits and human sacrifice parallels the association of those who are militantly non-Graeco-Roman in culture with such activities. The sacrifice carried out in mock in Achilles Tatius and for real in Dio may be seen as ceremonies designed to separate the bandit-soukoloi from the dominant Graeco-Roman culture. It could be interpreted as a form of group initiation that binds the conspirators by the magical potency and the horror of the act. The sacrifice, therefore, marks in these accounts a dramatic break from the cultural values of civilized society, signifying rebellion. Cross-dressing, in the attempt to fool the centurion, also represents a breach of normal social convention which although less dramatic than the sacrifice is still significant. It was an "un-Roman" thing to do, though given the circumstances, a centurion arriving in the town in order to collect taxes when all the men should have been out in the fields, such a strategy seems inherently reasonable.
This is, of course, the rhetorical position of banditry within modern and ancient sources but the position of modern bandits within social systems is more informative. Study of the brigands of nineteenth-century Greece shows that the "social bandit" was a development of the early twentieth century. It was an intellectual creation of the historians and poets who sought to glorify Greece's struggle for liberation. Bandits, in fact preyed upon the peasants of the lowlands and the shepherds of the highlands. They were recognised by the authorities and licensed to act in regions where the level of governmental control was slight. They were less the representatives of a depressed peasantry struggling against foreign domination than semi-feudal warlords, controlling powerful bands over generations.75 Blok's study of the Mafia in a Sicilian village points to a bandit organisation in league with the forces that oppress the peasantry.77 All these studies of well-established bandit groups point to the integration of bandit activities and the normal social structure. Banditry was not a reaction to a particular situation, it was an integral part of society.

The Boukoloi may well have represented a group such as this. Their ferocity and independence were clearly not a reaction to short term economic factors. Our evidence from other regions suggests that bandit activity was less regular than amongst the Boukoloi. Crisis drove the people from
their homes and then they were less well controlled. The complaint from Oxyrhynchus shows how a stranger was able to operate outside of normal controls to build up violent supporters, though it is likely that this man had some powerful local backer. It is also clear that banditry could and did take place on a local scale without the bandits withdrawing from their local communities. Baebius Iuncus's decree and the fragment of an interrogation from Antinoopolis suggests that communities could turn to violence without leaving their area. Baebius Iuncus sought to separate the bandits from the local community and in the Antinoopolis document a whole village was implicated. The fate of the village of Petetei destroyed by the army suggests a similar belief on the part of the authorities. In addition to this, there is the model suggested by the story of Hippotaoos of a bandit gang roaming the Empire. There is a vast range of social violence that comes under the heading of banditry.

Although we can detail the activities of the bandits, it is difficult to move from that analysis to a study of the military threat presented to the Roman forces by these activities. The various decrees of the prefects do not suggest that the problem was intractable. The soldiers are held out as a threat to the bandits and those who had fled from the homes of the coming retribution. It is quite
clearly assumed that the soldiers would be able to deal with any of the problems that arose and would put down any bandit group, as happened to the Hippothoos gang. The Thmouis roll details the retaliation of the soldiers. Bandits were troubling, irritating, damaging to trade and, more importantly, taxes, but do not seem to have been a military threat. The government was concerned but did not take serious action until problems had reached a head. It is impossible to say what would provoke the Romans into action, what level of violence they would tolerate before using troops, as it would vary from period to period. In a time of political tension, one prefect might feel that it was necessary to publicise his active policy, another might ignore any activity short of full scale revolt. Yet banditry provided another problem for the Roman authorities. The bandits disrupted the ordinary economic activities of the people. In economic crisis, banditry worsened the crisis, depleted already scarce resources and inflamed difficult situations. Banditry provided the peasantry with a possible alternative source of income when times were hard and so could further worsen the times for non-bandits.

The revolt of the Doukolia must represent this kind of escalation. The Doukoli are led by the priest Isidoros according to Dio. Isidoros may just be a name used to give credence to a story but it is likely that the Romans knew
the name of the native leader of the revolt. Although we know very little of the nature of the social structure of native Egyptian society, the priesthood would seem to be an obvious source of local power. It is clear that the revolt has a distinctly Egyptian cultural context. It is also clear that the revolt was more than a number of bandits getting out of control. It was a major revolt. The prefect Statianus had assumed that after the Roman military intervention the situation was returning to normal. Normality is suggested by the story of the centurion wandering into a town of the Boukoloi to supervise the collection of money. The Egyptians rose up in vast numbers, defeating the Roman forces and advancing towards Alexandria. It was an explosion of native resistance brought on by the economic crisis, banditry, and the Roman reaction. It was not a bandit rebellion as such but a major social revolt.

The time has come to reach some conclusions. The major revolts of the caura were both religiously inspired uprisings. Significantly, the Jews and Boukoloi are referred to in our documentation by the adjective "impious". The passages describing the revolts in Dio are astonishingly similar, from the references to the leadership to the atrocities committed. Both groups advanced unsuccessfully upon Alexandria, but were driven off. Both groups swept aside the Roman forces in the caura, and could only be
defeated by the intervention of reinforcements from other provinces. Both revolts were associated with major social disruption. My study of the literary evidence has shown, especially in relation to the revolt of the Soukolia, that we perceive the revolt through the eyes of the elite, as represented in the novels and the histories. These revolts appear as outbreaks of violently anti-Roman or anti-Greek feeling and might make it appear as if the Romans in Egypt were desperately trying to maintain control over a powder keg of non-Roman cultural interests, banditry and local patriotism. This is, however, the Roman representation. Yet the study of banditry helps us keep this in perspective. Small scale banditry and disruption was common and tolerable in Egypt and may not be related to major social problems or even discontent. As we shall see later in the work there is no evidence of any hostility between the Roman veterans and native Egyptians. There is no sense of imminent inter-communal violence in the papyrological and archaeological records of the Fayyum villages. There is no sense of a native population awaiting the opportunity to rise up against foreign oppressors. When the rebellions did flare there were strong religious overtones, but surely this is to be expected in societies where religion is such an important part of group definition. The social revolt of the Soukolia, and possibly the Jewish revolt in the qnora as well, was
caused by a combination of factors but not great nationalistic movements.

It is also significant that when these revolts took place the Roman military were defeated. In both revolts they lost control of the agora to the rebels but secured Alexandria. This might be coincidence but certainly suggests the tactical priorities of the Roman forces. The Romans seem to have been ill-prepared to deal with such outbreaks. Part of the reason for this, and their delay in dealing with problems effecting such areas as the Boukolia, must lie in the normal ease with which they dealt with the small scale problems: rebels and bandits could be dealt with by comparatively small numbers of troops but a large scale revolt with popular support was a different matter. Faced with such a revolt, the Romans turned to the local administration. The latent military role of the strategoi was revived and the administrators commanded native forces. The Roman garrison did not expect nor have enough men to deal with such an outbreak and it is improbable that this was the real function of the army anyway. Even if we do not accept the ancient figures for the ancient population of Egypt, it is at least probable that the Romans gave credence to such figures and these suggest that the Roman garrison was tiny in comparison. Only vast technical superiority would have given the Romans an advantage and the reports of
their defeat at the hands of the Jews and Boukoloi and Avidius Cassius's reluctance to commit his forces suggests that this was not sufficient.
Peacetime Activities

The actions of the army in the first and second centuries A.D., has produced a mass of documentation of varying quality. I intend to use this documentation to try and reconstruct the role of the army when it was not actually fighting a war. Interpretation of such material is made all the more difficult by the diversity of its type and content. The range of activities undertaken by the army has long been noted but the problem for the historian is how to put such activities into a particular context and how to assess the importance of these activities. A list of the activities undertaken is merely a useful start to the study and the problem comes when we wish to derive meaning from those activities. First, we must examine the evidence in detail to establish the range of activities and the context of those activities before attempting any such analysis.¹

The use of soldiers as a convenient labour force for manual work is comparatively rarely attested outside a context which could be seen as military, such as the building of roads or the guarding of government property. On arrival in Egypt, Augustus is said to have set his soldiers to work on the canals, clearing them out and repairing them and
so improving the economy of Egypt. There is no parallel for soldiers being used in such a way in Egypt for the next five centuries, as far as I have been able to find. Canal repair work was most often done by corvées levied on the local population and not by the soldiers. Their use for this purpose may have a narrowly political motive. An alternative would be to look for some major reconstruction work that had to be completed in the aftermath of the wars but this could hardly be a major factor. It is more likely that Augustus publicised his good management of Egypt's resources in contrast to that of his immediate predecessors. In any case, if the soldiers were ever involved, the task was exceptional.

Yet soldiers were used in areas where the economic workings of the country were involved. They were involved in the building of roads, bridges, and public buildings; the collection and transportation of grain down the river to Alexandria; tax and customs collection; the guarding of important trade routes; and the supervision of the mines. The association of soldiers and tax collectors must in part be related to the unpopularity of the activities of the said officials. The scope for corruption and extortion would be increased if a soldier was present during the collection of the taxes to guarantee the safety of the tax man. The literary evidence shows us a centurion being paid taxes, or
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at least some money, in the company of a companion of some kind in the Delta from the people of the Boukolia in the late second century and thus sparking off the revolt of these people.⁴ In A.D. 75 in the Fayum a soldier was associated with the sitologos in a rather obscure context but which was probably related to taxes on grain.⁵ In the village of Komos c. 15 B.C., the ferry-man who was operating the only ferry across a newly built canal had his books examined by the tax collector Apollos. This man was accompanied by a soldier and they proceeded to steal two cloaks from the ferry-man's house.⁶ In the third-century Oxyrhynchite the collection of taxes got out of hand since the collector, although not doing anything illegal, seemed to be a little too enthusiastic about his task. Soldiers had to be sent in to protect him.⁷ More direct evidence for the involvement of soldiers in the collection of taxes comes from a very badly damaged account of the taxes paid on salt. The account comes from Oxyrhynchus but seems to be a cumulative total of taxes collected by soldiers from several units which might suggest that the figures were cumulative totals for income over a substantial area. There are at least four cohorts involved and three of the names are readable: I Flavia Cilicia, II Ituraeorum, and I Lusitanorum. One ala is mentioned which is probably the ala Vocontiorum. All these units were attested in Egypt throughout the second century. The money and the accounts
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were despatched to the appropriate authority, who may have been Irenaeus, imperial freedman, by two centurions, Valerius Perpetuus and Livius. 8

Soldiers were also involved in the supervision of the grain boats down the Nile. In A.D. 42, a centurion accompanied a shipload of grain down the Nile as epiploos, a ship's guard. The use of such an officer does not seem to have been standard practice and this was perhaps just a convenient way for the centurion to travel down the river. 9

In A.D. 13, the epiploos on a shipment was an ordinary soldier 10 and in an undated document of the first century the epiploos was a soldier of the XXII legion. 11 The duty seems to have become a liturgic post imposed on the local population by the second century. However, there still seems to have been soldiers involved in the shipment since a second-century document from the Oxyrhynchite attests payments made to soldiers during the shipping of grain. We are not told why the soldiers were paid and it may have been that these payments were absolutely standard. The function of the epiploos was to guarantee that the grain arrived in Alexandria in the same state that it had left the chora. The presence of a soldier on the boat would have guaranteed this but it was equally efficient to make it a liturgic function so that the epiploos would personally guarantee the good condition of the grain. It may even be that both methods
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were used simultaneously. The transfer of the grain and the registration of the shipment would obviously require a considerable bureaucratic effort which might explain the continued involvement of the soldiery in these activities.

The involvement of soldiers in the supervision and the guarding of the state's economic assets is clearly demonstrated by the involvement of soldiers in the mines. The excavations currently underway at Mons Claudianus in the Eastern desert make any detailed comment before the publication of their extensive finds unwise and pointless. The site was certainly under military command. In A.D. 19, the mines of the Eastern desert were under the control of Tiberius Poplius Iuventius Rufus. This official had the aid of Mammogais son of Bataios of cohors Niger. The centurion Annius Rufus from the XV Apollinaris legion was in charge under Trajan. In 118, the chain of command at the mine appears to put Caeresimos, an imperial freedman, in charge, but the military authority rested with the centurion Avitus of Flavia Cilicia equitata. Another Trajanic inscription is an altar to Helios-Sarapis erected when Encolpios was procurator and Q. Accius Optatus centurion by Apollonios son of Ammonios the Alexandrian architect. From Thebes, there is a contract of 143 between Semphasies daughter of Boucheos from Thmorbos of the Upselitos nome, mother and heir of Ammonios son of Ammonios and Iulius Silvanus, optio of the
century of Claudius recording the receipt of the worldly goods of Ammonios. The deceased had been a soldier and quarry man of cohors II Thracum. 16

These quarries of the Eastern desert had to be furnished with supplies and the garrisons that watched the roads to the quarries were, in the main, able to watch the caravans from the Red Sea ports passing on to Koptos to send the luxury goods of the Indian trade to the Mediterranean. A Koptos inscription of uncertain date records the repair of the fortlets across the desert by legionaries and auxiliary units drawn from the whole garrison of Egypt. 17 A further road was built across the desert in A.D. 137 in order to connect Antinoopolis to the Red Sea ports. It is difficult not to see this as an attempt by the authorities to ensure the success and the prosperity of Hadrian's new city by diverting the Eastern trade from Koptos to this site. The road was well fortified with many garrisons and resting points. 18 In A.D. 90, men of III Cyrenaica built a bridge at Koptos. 19 In Alexandria, Fl. Iulius Alexander organised the dedication of a dais to Isis for the use of the market officials. The dais had been put up by Flavia. 20 The army was inevitably involved in the erection of honorary monuments. Cohors I Flavia Cilicia erected two obelisks in honour of the emperors at Syene in 165. 21 The army also put inscriptions celebrating the rebuilding of camps. In 150-
152, the camp at Eunico was rebuilt by the cohors III Ituraeorum. In 174 the camp at Nikopolis was renovated and, beyond the period of study, the camp at Kantara was reconstructed in 288 by the ala I Thracum Mauretania.

By far the best attested of all the possible official activities the Roman army undertook are those that may be grouped under the heading of police work. These fall into two groups: the guarding of the desert routes and of frontiers and the policing of the chora of Egypt. The Florida ostraka from Edfu and the Amsterdam ostraka, probably from the same provenance, help to illuminate the system for guarding the desert. The ostraka seem to attest a mixture of civilian and military in the guard posts. The civilians were grouped in dekanoi which seem to have been under the general authority of a decurion. The decurion Herennius Antoninus wrote to Amatius asking him to send the son of Balaneos who was only a boy away and get the dekanos to replace him in the watchtower. The watchtower guards seem to have been predominantly Egyptian or at least they seem to have had non-Roman names. The work of these guards is probably reflected in the documents in the Amsterdam collection which appear to be duty rosters. The pattern seems to be that two guards were on duty and two guards were off and of those on one was "up" and the other was "down". Duties alternated daily, if that is the correct
interpretation of the numerals next to each group of duties, and the person "up" or "down" alternated with each duty. This presents certain difficulties of interpretation. In the Eastern desert there are remains of forts, fortlets and of watch towers. The survey archaeology conducted in the desert has shown that the Romans fortified all the water points along their roads across the desert and between these water points there were watchtowers. These forts or resting points were comparatively close together and a traveller could easily pass more than one in a night's travel, according to modern opinion. The watch towers and their guards are firmly placed in a military context not only by the documents connecting them to a decurion but also by the involvement of soldiers in the other documents of the collections. The ostraka attest various horsemen. The prefect of the unit does appear in the documentation but the important officers appear to be the decurions. Aponius Didymianus, decurion, wrote to the curator, Iulianus, asking him to send Atreides, a horseman, to him as he was required by the prefect. Another decurion wrote to a curator about the dekanoi, payments of money, and persons whom he wished to be sent to him. Herennios wrote to a curator and Tullius sent Iulius Maximus to Iulianus who was probably the curator. Aelianus received a letter from a decurion about a cavalryman. Antonius, decurion, summoned the tower guard in a letter to the curator of the camp at Aphis. The
prefect is remote and the levels of communication we have illustrated here are between the decurions and the curators. The curators were obviously the people in charge of the particular forts. We would be at a considerable advantage if these ostraka were firmly dated but they can only be dated on palaeographic grounds to the mid-second century. There is also very little about the actual duties of those in the desert. There is a mention of tax collectors in an Amsterdam ostrakon and the decurion Herennius Antoninus summoned a local who had burnt the reeds near the new praesidium to him.\(^35\) Perhaps more instructive is the archive from the Wadi Fawakhir which may date from the reign of Gaius. The prefect seems to have had the soldiers out hunting wild beasts but most of the archive seems to have been about the daily requirements of life in a remote, desolate place. Demands for food, drink, paper and other needs dominate the letters to friends and families of the soldiery.\(^36\) The everyday life of the Roman soldier as reflected in the ostraka was of inaction and seeming purposelessness. Yet the records that we have would not reflect the overall purpose of the forts. Such documents would only reflect what the soldiers felt was worth commenting upon which would be the unusual not the usual. The archaeology of the roads across the desert creates something of a problem. The towers must have been reached by a ladder since there was no door and their view of the road is sometimes obstructed. They appear to be
signalling stations of some kind. What they were signalling and to whom is still a matter of some dispute. One possibility is that the towers would warn of bandit attack. They would either warn the caravan or the troops. The presence of one of the two men on duty "down" suggests slightly that he was there to monitor the travellers on the road.37

The very numbers of the towers and the forts of the desert suggest that there was a large number of troops in the Eastern desert, either made up of dekanoi or of Roman forces. Dekanoi are attested elsewhere. At Soknopaiou Nesos, dekanoi were collecting the customs duties in A.D.49.38 However, the vast majority of references come from the Thebaid. The groups in this area are numbered from 1-89 though most of the numerals run 1-40. These obviously represent the different district organisations. Bagnall calculates that there were probably about fifteen districts with about forty dekanoi each containing on average nine men giving a total available force of 5,400. It is unlikely that these forces would be used anything like all the time and would almost certainly rotate duties. Nor is it likely that everyone went out into the desert since the Thebaid must have had some internal security needs. However, we still see in this institution an important element in the security of Roman Egypt.39
The soldiery also had to guard the borders and actually man the garrisons of the Eastern desert. The troops at Syene watched the Southern border where three cohorts were based. The manning of the watchtowers and the policing of Roman Egypt will be discussed at greater length below but it is clear that the Roman troops were responsible for some parts of this work. A soldier is seen manning a watch tower in an ostrakon from Koptos.\textsuperscript{41} The archives attest the existence of praesidia manned by Roman troops and the dekanoi man other forts or fortlets. The policing activities of the Roman army are well attested in these areas of the Eastern desert. Even better attested than this are the activities of the centurions and other senior officers in the chora and it is to this area that I now turn.
Study of the policing role of the army in the chora necessitates consideration of the evidence concerning the centurions. There is a great deal of information and a vast number of documents but it is useful to detail the range of documentation before more detailed analysis.

The first document involves Petesouchos son of Petesouchos who stood surety to the Anchoriphos, centurion of Sendryae in the Arsinoite in 20 B.C., for the appearance of a woman before the centurion. 42 From Soknopaiou Nesos, where many of the petitions seem to come from, there is an account of A.D. 15 of proceedings against Satabous son of Herleus which had involved the centurion Lucretius, the basilikos grammateus, and the strategos without seemingly making progress in the dispute over land tenure. 43 Another petition involving the same man and the same centurion comes from three years earlier when Satabous appealed for the centurion to act following the resolution of a dispute by the strategos. The centurion was not asked to enforce the judgement but to prevent a violent reaction to Satabous's victory. 44

The centurion Q. Gaius Passer received a complaint in A.D. 31 from Teis in the Oxyrynchite. Hermenios son of Demetrios owned a fish pond which was being raided. When he approached them he found that the soldier Titius was aiding
the criminals and they removed him from the scene by threats of violence. There is a possibility that this was referred to him because of the involvement of a soldier.45

The centurion C. Trebius Iustus received a complaint of assault on a public farmer of Euhemeria by the shepherds in A.D. 37.46 Nemesion, a tax collector based in Philadelphia, persuaded a villager to swear to the centurion [...itius Catullus that he would either produce his parents or pay their outstanding taxes within twenty-five days and a petition of A.D. 49/50, which is also probably part of the archive of Nemesion, asks an unknown official to write to the centurion Claudius (Clotius) so that he might compel Horion the tax man in Philadelphia to do his job.47 Limnaios son of Limnaios wrote to the centurion Lucius about a mugging just outside Karanis in A.D. 71. Limnaios was an assistant to the manager of the ousia of Doryphoros.48

Stotoetis son of Apunchis, priest of Soknopaion Nesos, who had been beaten up by several members of a family whilst attempting to collect a debt, complained to the centurion Messius Audax.49 Audax was petitioned by a long list of metropolites from the village of Bakchias to remove the archnepnodoi and the sitoloioi against whom they had obtained judgement from the Prefect Minucius Italus who was prefect between 101 and 103.50
An incomplete petition of 104 was addressed to the centurion Iulius. The petitioner was a shore-guard who had been watching sluice gates. It is not quite clear what the substance of the problem was. In 124, a centurion took charge of a court case in the Fayum.  

A beneficiarius appears in a case from Soknopaiou Nesos from 139. The petition is to the epistrateos of the district from a man who had been Arab-archer at the customs house. He, discovering that the collection of duties had been in the hands of one man for a longer period than was strictly legal, obtained the account books for examination and discovered that the treasury was being defrauded. However, the customs man became aware that his private accounts were missing and attacked him with several other people, setting the "sword bearer" of the estates on him and then taking him to the accounts house of the estate where he was finally forced to give up the account books. The nomarch and the beneficiarius "over the areas" knew about the matter and he appealed to the epistrateos to arrest the miscreants.  

Horos son of Satabous who was acting as guardian for his two nephews, wrote to the centurion Annicius Petronianus in 148, worried about the disappearance of the man he had rented the land of his nephews to, land in Soknopaiou Nesos.
which seemed to be being farmed by someone else. Valerius Maximus centurion "over the places" received a letter from Tavetia daughter of Stotoetis, priestess of Soknopaiou Nesos, praising his philanthropy and making a claim on the aforementioned virtue as a defenceless widow, but for what purpose we do not know. A clue may be provided by a letter of the same person to Heronos, beneficiarius of the prefect "over the places" complaining of theft in 167.

Antonius Longus, decurion, received a petition from Herais, villager of Theadelphia, whose house had been attacked by robbers who beat up her household and robbed them of all their possessions. The document is dated to the second century. The decurion Longus, probably the same man, was told of an assault by a gang with the intent to murder two brothers from the village of Tebtunis in 167.

From Thmouis in the Mendesian nome, the actions of a centurion in the run up to the revolt of the Boukoloi are mentioned. In 167-3, the village of Zmounis was attacked by the impious Nikochites who had a severe effect on the population of the town. The centurion Quadratus reported the matter to the prefect as did the strategos of the nome, Horion. The literary evidence also details the presence of a centurion in the region of the Boukolia, possibly collecting taxes. The centurion and his companion were
assaulted by the rebels in disguise as women and the
centurion immediately killed. His companion is said to have
been sacrificed. 60

Between 175 and 180 the centurion Phr[...jios Proklos
received a petition from Pabous, priest at Soknopaiou Nesos,
calling upon him to intervene in a dispute over inheritance
that had come to blows. 61

Aurelius Abous, veteran, wrote to the centurion
Severus Iustus asking his aid in the reclamation of property
he had left with a fellow soldier when they were based at
Pelusium. Although this is in a military context, it is
worth including here as Abous is by 177 a veteran and is
still pressing his claims through the centurion. 62

From Tebtunis, Eudaimonidas son of Zoilos complained
that the village elders were extorting grain by violence.
The centurion Aurelius Antoninus was informed. 63 This
centurion was addressed in a complaint from a villager of
Soknopaiou Nesos who was being abused by the man who held
property in common with her and who had threatened her with
death. In this dire situation she wrote to the centurion in
184. 64 There is another petition of this year addressed to
Aurelius Antoninus but the officer involved in this petition
was a decurion in Aphrodisias. 65
In 135, there was a complaint of assault addressed to the beneficiarius "in charge of the places". The man had been attacked by a villager elder who insisted that he produce two of his relatives who had been selected to perform the epiploos liturgy but who had disappeared. The violent disappointment of the elder was such that the petitioner felt it necessary to bribe him to go away.66

A decurion of 188/9 whose name is lost received a petition about the misbehaviour of officials collecting the grain taxes.67

Valerius Germanus, centurion, received a complaint in 192 from Sabinus Zosimus about damage done at his threshing floor at Karanis by persons unknown. He wished the matter included in the register so that it would be known that he had a complaint against them.68 In 193, Syros son of Syros also called Petesekas from the metropolis appealed to Ammonius Paternus, centurion, to act against two collectors of grain tax who had arrived at his and his brother's house to demand the final instalment of the grain owed in taxes when the brothers were out and had assaulted their mother. They wanted the collectors brought to justice.69 Ammonius Paternus also received a petition from the village of Boubastis in the Themistes district of the Arsinoite nome in the same year. This reported the theft during the night of
two boxes of vegetable seed and begged the centurion to investigate the case. Melanos son of Horion, priest of Soknopaiou Nesos, wrote to this centurion in 193 asking him to intervene in a violent dispute over an inheritance.

A petition from 198 from the C.Iulius Niger archive was addressed to the epistratēgos Calpurnius Concessus asking him to write to the "empowered centurion in the Arsinoite" so that he would act against the tax collector Kastor from the village of Karanis who was oppressing Gemellus alias Horion son of C.Apollinarius. The petition about the actions of the tax collector had previously been to the Prefect who had referred the matter back to the centurion but this petition to the epistratēgos does not suggest that Gemellus had sent the petition to the centurion. Possibly the centurion had refused to act. Also of interest is the precision in the geographical limitation of the powers of the centurion. "The decurion of the Arsinoite" appears in another dispute over a will from Tebtunis in the second century.

Domitian Iulianus wrote a letter summoning persons unknown before him as their case was pending in the second century. The same centurion received a petition from Karanis but we do not know the substance of the affair.
Claudius Herennius, decurion, received from Pasis son of Metais of Soknopaiou Nesos a complaint against Kalabelis who had not only prevented Pasis from reaching home but had assaulted him in an effort to delay the discovery of the thefts that had taken place there. The centurion was asked to arrest Kalabelis. 76

An unnamed centurion appears in a second-century document. Sarapodos wrote to his brother Phanion about several matters including moves towards the resolution of a dispute between the brothers and a "sword bearer" which the centurion had decided should be referred to arbitration. 77

Gallus, centurion, received a petition in 201 from Heraklea, daughter of Didymus the Antinoopolite, asking him to take action against her husband who, although they had had two children and she was faithful, had run off to another village and was spending her dowry. 78

Iulius Claudianus, centurion, received a complaint from two public farmers from the village of Soknopaiou Nesos in 201 complaining that their rights over a piece of land that they had farmed for twenty-five years were being questioned by a corrupt official. 79
The decurion Antoninus A. t[......]us received in 201 a request from the villagers of Soknopaiou Nesos asking for his permission to summon flute players and others for the forthcoming festivities to celebrate the birthday of the Emperor and some Egyptian festival as well. The decurion may be the same man who is attested as serving in the ala veteranana Gallica. 80

Iulius Iulianus, centurion, received a petition in 207 from villagers of Soknopaiou Nesos concerning land in another village which they had always farmed. The ownership of the land was now being disputed. 81 The same man received a petition, together with the decurion Iulius Conon, about a missing person. Nemesion was a tax collector from Philadelphia who had gone out one day and not returned and, in spite of searches, his wife claimed to have lost him. 32

Nomios, son of Arios, from the village of Soknopaiou Nesos asked the centurion Quintillianus to intervene in a dispute over inheritance when the guardian was accused of defrauding the heirs in 211. 33 A Crenoleius Quintillianus appears in the same year receiving an oath from Demetrios son of Satyros to produce Pasis son of Apollonius. They come from Bithynos in the Arsinoite. 34
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Tesenouphis son of Stoteotis, public farmer of Soknopaioi Nesos, appealed to the centurion C. [m[..]enius for damages because cattle had been allowed to stray onto his property and damage the crops in 213.85

In 214, Satyros son of Maron reported to the centurion the mysterious fire that destroyed his field which was in crop at the time. Aurelius Valerianus was asked to investigate these events in Karanis.86

Valerius Apollinarius of Antinoopolis wrote to the centurion Aurelius Septimius Iulianus in 215 to ask him to investigate an illegal entry to and act of vandalism in his house at Karanis. He had already informed the public officials.87

In A.D. 216, Aurelius Pakysis son of Tesenouphas, priest at Soknopaioi Nesos, wrote to Aurelius Calvisius Maximus, centurion, to inform him that grain that Pakysis had left in the house of his daughter-in-law had been stolen by neighbours by means of a hole in the floor. Locally, nothing had been done to restore the stolen goods and so he now asked the centurion to deal with the malefactors. On the same day a letter was written to the stratēgos Aurelius Didymus informing him of the theft.88
Isidora from Karanis wrote to the centurion Aurelius Iulius Maximus in the late second or early third century demanding that he act against Pachon son of Ptolemaios who had come to her house when her brother was away in the army and stolen all her money. The implication is clearly that she could not be expected to fend for herself in this matter.  

At the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, the centurion Domitius Annianus wrote to the people of Taurinus near Eunemeria telling them to make sure that their watch tower was fully manned.

Magnus Felix Crescentillianus, prefect (A.D. 253-5), wrote to the strategoi of the nomes asking them to hand over their taxes and to remind the centurions, if they delayed in their areas for long, to return to Alexandria with all speed to celebrate the imperial birthday.

Aurelius Iulius Marcellinus received a report that two hunters, father and son, from Tebtunis had gone missing. Aurelia Tisais, the wife and mother of the disappeared appealed to the centurion to bring the malefactors to justice. She was sure they had been attacked and had reported their disappearance to the strategoi.
Aurelius Basileides, centurion, received a petition from the tax collector of Tebtunis some point between 222-235. The tax collector had while staying in the village had his ass stolen and after searching the village it was found outside the boundaries, killed by persons unknown. The centurion is asked to investigate. 93

In Edfu, in 223, the decurion who was buying four birds was addressed as "Isidorianus decurion in charge of the peace". 94

A petition of 236 to the strate:os of the Arsinoite, Herakleides district notifies him of the theft of eight sheep belonging to an Arab-archer by persons unknown. The theft was to be registered with the strate:os so that if the malfeactors were ever caught he would have a claim. The Arab-archer had also informed the centurion and the decurion. 95

Aurelius Apollonius, the decurion received a petition complaining of the theft of an ass in 255 from Aurelius Sakis son of Maximus from Theoxenis in the Arsinoite. 96

At Oxyrhynchus in 237-9 a centurion of the prefect's office was appointed to sit on a land tribunal. 97
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A petition from Philadelphia of the third century refers to a dispute over a will probably involving Roman and Antinoopolite citizens. Another third-century case heard by a decurion may have involved theft. A decurion from Hermopolis Magna received complaints about violence offered to a tax collector. Liberalis wrote to the "centurion over the places" in a document of the same century found at Tebtunis. Liberalis had been investigating the account books and had come to some conclusions about land held there which had previously belonged to the polis. The centurion was obviously intended to help reclaim the land. A third-century letter attests the workings of influence on a decurion. The arrested Harpokras had been released by the decurion as a favour to Chromation. No-one was to know, when the inevitable questions started, where he had gone. The beneficiarius "over the places" was given a complaint of assault by persons unknown outside Tebtunis from the third century.

From Oxyrhynchus from the third or fourth century comes an interesting invitation from the decurion to his dining hall on the sixth day before the Kalends. The decurion does not give his name. From the same period, there is an order to arrest issued by the decurion and another issued by the beneficiarius on duty both from the Oxyrhynchite. Two documents of 292 refer to the decurion
Aurelius Didymus who was in charge of the peace in the Herakleopolite nome. 107

To these papyrological sources must be added one relevant inscription from Arsinoe. This was an inscription set up by the secretary to the centurions of the Arsinoite proclaiming his own virtue. 108

This gives some impression of the range of material concerning the centurions. It is possible to group the cases very generally. Almost half the cases in which some cause can be found concern assault. Another concern seems to have been military or administrative misdemeanours which seems to involve about 25% of cases. Violence against property makes up about a third of cases and this includes theft which makes up about 15% of all cases. Only a small proportion of cases involve people who were accused of avoiding their social responsibilities, such as defrauding their wards or deserting their wives whilst retaining their dowries. The petitioners often made claims to some sort of special status. They were either tax collectors or priests or had a higher legal status. Tax collectors compose about 13% of the petitioners. Higher legal status groups make up about 22% of the petitioners. A few people appeal to the chivalrous instincts of the centurions by suggesting that they had no-
one else to turn to, about 11% seem to have been priests, and about 7% were public farmers. All in all about 55% of the petitioners made some claim of special status. These figures are very approximate and their significance is dependent upon the problems of preservation. We can see that access to the centurion-figures was not dependent upon status or upon the crimes committed, although the centurions had their areas of interest. It seems as if there was a gradual widening of the interests of the centurions since the early references seem to involve more cases of assault and less of the other matters but the number of cases is so small that this must only be an impression.

It seems reasonably clear that these men were Roman troops. If all the officials were described as centurions then there would be a suspicion that this was merely a title given in imitation of the Roman military. However, the presence of decurions and beneficiarii, including the documents of 207 and 236 which are addressed to a centurion and a decurion, would appear to be conclusive. The absence of any military units to which these men are attached is slightly surprising. Indeed, we can only possibly find one of these men attested elsewhere. The decurion Antoninus Antiochianus may appear in these documents, if the restoration of his name in the document of 201 is correct. The Aurelii Antonini of 164 warn against a simple approach.
These are active at the same time but in different areas and holding different titles. The possibility that these refer to the same person cannot be ruled out and if this is the case it suggests that the title may be random. The official may be called centurion or decurion depending on the whim of the writer or, possibly, one of the petitioners was in error. However, the officer(s) had the imperial name and it must be more likely that these were two different people. Still, it remains a possibility that these officials were not normal centurions but were given this title when they served in the nomes. The regularity of the names, all Roman except Anchoripnos, suggests that these were not the ordinary soldiers and horsemen of the army since we would expect considerably more variation in the nomenclature. There are very few soldiers in the accounts but as most of these are petitions to the senior officer we would not necessarily expect the ordinary soldier to appear. But, on occasion, there are soldiers who appear in the documentation in contexts that would associate them with these centurions. A late second- or early third-century order to arrest from Philadelphia issued by Sarapion to the archepholo suggests that a soldier will be sent to collect the arrested/in due course. There is no sign in the documentation that the titles may be inflated, no sign of a "pro-centurial" office. These were real centurions, decurions, and beneficiarii.
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The relationship between the "military" and the "civil" authorities must be of great interest. Again, the evidence is not of a type to provide us with clear-cut guide-lines. There are double petitions: one to the strategos and one to the centurion. The strategos seems to have had a more passive role. They record the events in the official registers. The centurion may be asked to bring wrong-doers to justice, extend searches over large areas, or offer concrete protection. However, the passivity of the strategos should not be taken as distinctive of the office.

There are many complaints to the strategos about violence within the villages and the nome capitals. The strategos Horion wrote the report to the Prefect about the impious Nikochites with the centurion Quadratus. The complaints which were preserved in what was almost certainly the house or office of the archepheodos of Eunameria published as P.3/1 II 24-152 from the first half of the first-century frequently mention the strategos as the official who ordered arrests. They also mention an epistrates phylakeiton, an office which could be held jointly with that of strategos. The structures of Ptolemaic village policing remained in place. There are a few "sword-bearers" attested, perhaps associated with the local great estates, the archepaodoi still seem to be functioning as the primary police force of the villages, and there are numerous guards of various types. There does seem to be cooperation between the two
spheres and the prefect Crescellentius wrote to the 
strategoi instructing them to send the centurions to 
Alexandria. It is possible that the centurion was in the 
nome to supervise the activities of the higher status groups 
within the nome. The refusal of Horion or Gemellus son of 
C.Apollonius to put his complaint to the strategos may have 
something to do with his attempts to defend his status as an 
Antinoite. However, many ordinary people seem to write to 
the centurions. Numerous complaints deal with the corruption 
of the local officials, but then such officials are often 
targets of complaints. There is no need to see the centurion 
as having a supervisory role over the local administration. 
There are two occasions when centurions seem to be being 
given instructions. On only one of these occasions is the 
instructor of the centurion known. The official is the 
epistrategos. The epistrategos was an official of equestrian 
status, a supervisor of several nomes, one step down from 
the prefect and one step up from the strategoi. The prefects 
or the tribunes of the military units of the centurions 
never appear in this type of evidence.

The geographical competence of the centurions seems in 
much of the documents to be vague. The phrase "in charge of 
the places" seems to have been reasonably commonly employed. 
Later documents do seem to be a bit more specific, referring 
to the officer "in charge of the peace of the
Herakleopolite" and there are references to the centurion of the Arsinoite. The Arsinoite was a slightly strange nome in that it was not under the control of a single strategos but was divided for administrative purposes into the Herakleides district and the Themistes and Polemon district. There were two strateoi for the nome. If the centurion was limited in competence to the nome then we might expect that there would be two centurions in the Arsinoite but both Aurelius Antoninus and Ammonius Paternus were given petitions from different administrative areas. The occasional precision of the references to the officials is probably not that significant and perhaps the precision is only relative. To refer to the decurion or the centurion of the Arsinoite may not refer to a specified geographical competence but to a more general involvement with the area. Gemellus alias Horion did not want the epitratevos sending his letter to a centurion who was miles from the Arsinoite but one in a position to help. "Arsinoite" may have the force of "local". The pattern of dates for which an individual centurion or decurion is attested in the area of the Arsinoite is of interest. These dates are closest together at the end of the second century. Valerius Germanus is attested in 192 and Ammonius Paternus is in the Arsinoite in the following year. From 201-2, there are three separate centurion figures; Gallus, Iulius Claudianus, and Aurelius Antiochianus. In 207, the decurion Iulius Conon appears in the same document.
as the centurion Iulius Iulianus. Quintilianus appeared in 211 and in successive years from 213 to 216 were Aurelius Valerianus, Aurelius Septimius Iulianus, and Aurelius Calvisius Maximus. Although the decurions and centurions spent long enough in the area for their names to become known, the length of their stay does not seem to have been great. Most of the centurions are known because of the one reference but the Iulius Iulianus and Iulius Conon document might suggest that more than one centurion figure was stationed in the area at one time. Apion, the secretary to the centurions, at first sight looks to confirm this but we might suspect that he was the secretary to many centurions over a period of time. The vast majority of the petitions are to one specified person which suggests that they were stationed in the area alone but if the appeal was a more informal one, to the good offices of a man of influence, we would envisage an appeal to the man by name. It is unlikely that the Iulii Conon and Iulianus overlapped by chance or that there was a transitional period when the old official introduced the new to the complexities of the job. Centurions appearing in the same year or in close succession may have been holding the office jointly.

The relationship between the soldiery and the civilians may be illuminated by a complaint addressed to the prefect M.Sempronius Liberalis and therefore from A.D.154-9,
from a man who had been thrown into prison by soldiers for, as far as he claims to be aware, no reason at all. A similar case took place in 158 when a man was imprisoned in the camp by the horseman Turbo, again with no known motivation. Both these cases suggest that the troops had some control over prisons. Unfortunately the provenance of both these documents is unknown. The two documents which show the relations between the officers and the civilians most clearly are the dinner invitation and the letter of the second or the third century which show that it was possible to release someone from custody given the right sort of influence. This and the dinner party invitation show the levels of integration into the society of the period. The dinner invitation is especially interesting as it does not give the name of the decurion who issued the invitation. The decurion asked the guest to come and dine with him in his dining room. The document is from the Oxyrhynchnite. Both these documents suggest the integration of these officials into the normal workings of influence with Egyptian society. They are, however, both quite late. The dinner invitation is from the third or fourth century and the position of the officials may have changed by that time.

We must try and sum up the position. There is no observable difference between the centurions and the decurions in the areas. There are occasional references to
soldiers but not enough to suggest that there were many soldiers in the area with the officer. The secretary to the centurions was a civilian who stayed in the office when the centurion or decurion moved on. He was not a soldier, not part of a "military bureaucracy". There is no sign of a more senior military officer but the centurion was expected to follow the instructions of the epistrateös. In the early second century, someone, possibly the prefect, wrote to Teres, decurion, informing him that the strateös of the Koptite nome had written to him requesting thirty days leave for the decurion to sort out private business in the Arsinoite. The unnamed official wrote not only to the strateös of the nome to inform him of the success of his request but also to the centurion Petronius Fidus. 115 The close relationship between the strateös and the centurion official in the area is attested. Also perhaps is another official in the area, Petronius Fidus, who would perhaps have to adapt to the temporary absence of the decurion, though there are other possibilities as to the reasons for informing the centurion. There seems to be an overlap in the duties of the "civilian" administration and those of the centurion and the fighting strateös of the Jewish disturbances suggest that this border between the civilian and military was breached by both sets of officials. 116 There was no absolute division between the two sets of functions.
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The centurion figures were the representatives of the prefect in the nomes. They were the visible face of Roman military power. To say that they had no discernibly separate function from that of the strategoi of the nomes is not to say that they did not perform any function. They were not dispersed through the nomes for no reason. The summoning of the centurions to Alexandria for the imperial birthday is important in a symbolic way. The prefect was summoning his military officials from the chor[a] to the city for a festival. It stressed the links between the centurions and the military authority of the state as it was represented at Alexandria. It is too schematic to see the strategoi simply as the representatives of local administration and the centurions as central administration but the soldiers did represent Roman authority for the local administrative network. This does not mean that they were in opposition or that one was in some way supervising the other. Inevitably, they worked together, as we can see from the Thmouis tax roll, but they had different sources of power and influence.

The centurions were interested in violent crime, especially of the type that might be associated with bandit activity. Their distribution throughout the chor[a] was not as a "police force" as such since the policing was still in the hands of the Egyptian local authorities, but as a source of information and military power. They provided the strategoi
with a source of help, if situations got out of hand, and the prefect with a source of information, if there was trouble. It is a model which would see the centurion of the pax Romana as the equivalent of the gunboat of the pax Britannica. The centurion sent to the Boukolia to supervise the collection of taxes without any guard and who was then killed by the rebels was a guarantor of the safety of the poor tax man who was the main target of the wrath of the rebels. 117 This is a theoretical position explaining the presence of the centurions but the way they operated was almost certainly along different lines. They were the symbol of Roman military force, a more or less direct link to the prefect; they were interested in the smooth running of the local administration and preventing discontent. It was inevitable that the centurions would receive petitions asking for their help in rectifying wrongs. The social status of a Roman centurion may have been greater in the first century than that of the Egyptian strategos. The relationship between crime and possible social discontent were clear and that these criminal activities escalated into rebellion could not have been a new discovery for the Roman authorities. Thus, the centurion received petitions about various administrative difficulties, about communal violence, about violence against and from officials and the gradual accumulation of expertise, meant a gradual accumulation of petitions and subjects referred to him until
centurions were being used in quasi-judicial functions, although as important Romans within the administration, they must always have been seen as having some legal competence. The centurions we see operating most clearly in the second century had a place, but not a clearly defined place, within the local administration. The locals expected them to perform a variety of tasks and such a free approach to the role of the centurion in the areas may be the position adopted by the authorities. The fact that both decurions, beneficiarii, and centurions appear in the nomes suggests that the appointments of officers for the performance of these ill-defined tasks were not standardised either. Their ill-defined duties and geographical distribution makes sense in such a loose model.

The role of the centurion in Egypt helps illuminate the general view of the centurionate and the subsequent careers of centurions. The centurionate was a possible avenue of progress towards equestrian status and further to some of the more important offices of state. Brunt writes that the military offices were now often held by ex-centurions, most of whom had worked their way up from the ranks, and who secured equestrian dignity. It was no doubt in order to make the army a more efficient fighting force that the emperors, not withstanding their general respect for the social hierarchy, were willing to promote
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professional soldiers, men who were generally of humble origins. But most tribunes and prefects were equites by birth.\textsuperscript{118} Brunt is also very doubtful of the suitability of ex-centurions for administrative and legal duties. The argument about the professional qualities of the Roman military and civilian administration has been a key area in discussions of how the Roman Empire was administered and worked. The evidence from Egypt shows that the centurions were performing legal and administrative duties, augmenting the civilian administration. It also shows that the civilian administration had latent military functions which could be revived in times of crisis. It has also long been known that equestrians could join the centurionate without any previous military experience. It seems that these centurions would perform exactly those minor judicial and administrative tasks that equestrians were expected to perform in Rome. It was this kind of task which would prepare the centurion-equestrian for higher office. The use of centurions for this task explains to some extent the entry of equestrians into the centurionate. It is more difficult to explain those who rose from the ranks but it may be that the connections and influence of the family of the ranker were not as humble as Brunt suggests. The centurions were performing tasks normally reserved for the aristocracy and is not surprising to find that some of them were of an elevated social status.
When we look outside the Egyptian chora to Alexandria and beyond, we see Roman soldiers performing similar functions. They are associated with banditry and crime and are dispersed throughout the countryside.\(^{119}\) Pliny wrote to Trajan about the administration of the prisons. He wanted to know whether he should use soldiers or slaves to guard the prisons and prisoners. Trajan wrote back saying that slaves were suitable for the purpose. This suggests that although soldiers should not be involved in such duties they were, in reality, performing such policing functions.\(^{120}\) He also forwarded a request from the magistrates of Juliopolis that they be sent a legionary centurion and some troops to deal with the large number of immigrants and travellers that came through the city who were causing problems. Again Trajan refused.\(^{121}\) A centurion stood guard at the cross when Jesus was crucified.\(^{122}\) Paul was rescued from the crowds by a centurion and troops.\(^{123}\) He was escorted to Italy by a centurion and, when in Italy, he was guarded by a soldier.\(^{124}\) In Germany, in A.D. 27, a centurion was in charge of the collection of tribute from the Frisii. The centurion freely interpreted the tax levels and caused a rebellion. His independence is noticeable but the tax was a specifically military tax and so this might be an exception.\(^{125}\) Cassius Dio discussed the actions of Varus in the period immediately before the revolt of the Germans. The army was not concentrated, as it should have been in times
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of war, but was dispersed through the countryside as guards, or to arrest robbers, or escort provision trains. Quite clearly the kind of role the Roman army was performing in this war-time context was that of a peace-time force. The description of the army would represent the normal activities of a peace-time army. Dio is not criticising the dispersal of the army as such, but the dispersal of the army in times of war. Dio's brief description of the campaign of Corbulo against the Chauci suggests that before commencing the campaign Corbulo "concentrated" his forces. Commodus issued orders that all assemblies of the Quadi and the Marcommani should take place in the presence of centurions. These troublesome Dacians were to be closely supervised. In 205, Severus had problems in central Italy with the robber baron Bulla who captured the centurion sent against him and shaved his head. This public humiliation caused Severus to send a tribune of the Praetorian guard to deal with him. The martyrdom of Polycarp, one of the more anti-semitic of the martyr acts, has the centurion intervene against the Jews of Smyrna who had taken the lead in the persecution of Polycarp and his fellow Christians and who wished to prevent the removal and burial of Polycarp's body. It is quite clear from the Christian account that the centurion was acting to preserve public order that had been breached by the Jews. The Martyrdom of SS Ptolemaios and Lucius also involves a
centurion. A husband acted against his wife's instructor in Christianity by contacting his friend the centurion. The centurion threw Ptolemaios into jail and then brought him before Urbicus on a charge of Christianity.\textsuperscript{131} Tertullian claimed that there was a fortress in every province for the searching out of thieves (bandits).\textsuperscript{132} Hadrian emphasised the dispersed nature of the Roman garrison of Africa.\textsuperscript{133} Aelius Aristeides provides us with some clear information: "".the cities are free from garrisons and cohorts and alae are enough to guard whole provinces, and not many of these are quartered throughout the cities but are scattered through the countryside so that many of the provincials do not know where their garrison is"".\textsuperscript{134} The army is clearly associated with the performance of ""law and order"" activities within the provinces and the pattern of deployment is dispersed. The passage of Aelius Aristeides suggests that the army is associated with country areas though the trials of offenders must have taken place in the cities. Philo's objections to the use of the army against the innocent Jews drew part of its fervour from the fact that it was unusual for the army to intervene within Alexandria. If we were to see this within the context of the use of the army against the low status Egyptians, the episode takes on a new significance.\textsuperscript{135}
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In the novel The Golden Ass, we see the army involved in policing activities. The administration of justice in the novel has been discussed by Fergus Millar. He came to the conclusion that "the world we are looking at is one wholly without policing by any Roman forces, except in one very extreme case". The extreme case is a story told by a man who wished to join a robber band and who claimed that he was Haemus, a successful robber baron, who had a stroke of bad luck in being attacked by Roman military forces which had been specially directed against him by the emperor because he had attacked a high ranking Roman. Haemus's band were almost certainly not exceptional. The description of their raid on the inn which was at the time occupied by the ex-procurator and his wife, does not suggest that the bandits were particularly numerous. The theft was a sneak theft. They did not intend to hold the entire inn by force and they fled at the first sign of trouble or wakefulness. The band appears small and mobile, not a miniature army. The story presented to the robbers must, as Millar says, be believable since it fools both the robbers, Lucius the ass, and, probably, the audience. The band would be virtually impossible to track down, once they had disappeared into the Greek mountains, without an enormous effort by the authorities. The efforts of those authorities to deal with such crime must have been of a mainly passive nature. The action in the novel which was clearly exceptional was the
scale of the Roman response to Haemus, sending the legions after the bandit even when his gang had reached the safety of their own territory. This does not mean that the Roman forces were not ordinarily concerned with such breaches of the peace.

The most famous encounter of Lucius the ass with the military was the attempt by the soldier to commandeer him from his temporary owner the gardener. The gardener was accosted by a soldier who, from his clothing and appearance, could be identified as a legionary. Having failed to respond to a challenge in Latin, the soldier struck the man across the back with a vine stick, knocking him from the ass. After pleading with the soldier, the gardener tripped him and beat him with a stone. The soldier was unable to rise or to draw his sword. He was left for dead by the gardener. The soldier was not dead and he called together a party of fellow soldiers who, without him, came to the town where they believed the gardener was hiding. They did not storm the house of his protector but demanded that the magistrates investigate the case. The magistrates sent lictors and other public officials to the house. The soldiers do not seem to have any legal powers in the town.

Millar's main aim is to stress the importance of self-help in the communities where the story was set. Throughout
the novel justice is implemented by the magistrates and by
the civil authorities. The army, apart from the brief
appearance of the soldier-bullies, does not have a large
role to play. Millar's point is very strong but there are a
few problems, not the least of which is the dramatic
contrast with the Egyptian evidence. Millar does have a
problem with the stick carried by the soldier. He draws
attention to the publication of an inscription and funerary
monument from Corinth which shows a miles carrying a stick
and writing tablets. He has a sword and the military
belt. The stick is normally seen as a symbol of the
centurion and so it is difficult to see quite why these
soldiers should be carrying them. But surely this is to make
the symbolic value of the stick its primary function. The
use of this implement by brutal centurions is well known. It
was used to strike without killing. In the Roman army, the
only people who would have a need for such an implement
would be the centurions and they would use it to beat the
troops. It would then become the symbol of the officer,
fearred and hated because of the use it was put to. The
soldiers wandering around Greece, carrying sticks of the
same type, were using them for the same function. They were
truncheons for beating the local population. The soldier in
Apuleius and the soldier commemorated by the funerary
monument in Corinth were carrying sticks not because they
were centurions but because they had need of an implement
that would chastise without killing. The attempt to conscript Lucius took place in the countryside and related to the transport of baggage from a *castellum* in the countryside. They were carrying out police functions in the countryside.

Millar is convincing when discussing the importance of the local law enforcement practices. However, there is evidence within the literary material for the importance of the Roman army in such activities. The novel, although containing scenes which are set in the country, is basically an urban piece of literature. We must remember Aelius Aristeides's assertion that the might of the Roman army in the provinces was lost in the countryside and that the majority of provincials, perhaps we might take liberties and say that the majority of urban provincials, did not know where their garrisons were. The world of *The Golden Ass* which is "wholly without policing by any Roman imperial forces" is an urban world but the novel hints at the other rural world which does have some clear evidence of Roman policing. We must deny any absolute division in policing between the town and the country since the interconnections between town and country were too many and too important to allow an absolute confinement of the Roman forces to the rural areas. But the Millar view of the continuity of local practice in the Empire in matters of crime is further backed
up by the Egyptian evidence. It is quite clear that throughout the chora a system of local administration of justice through the stratei remained in place during the Roman period. Millar's evidence, far from contrasting with the picture of the centurions in Egypt, can be seen to supplement it.

One further question arises out of the Apuleius material. The centurions of Egypt are centurions and decurions yet the man in Apuleius is a soldier. It might be suggested that the centurions were honoured with the title because of the granting, temporarily, of the vine stick but the epigraphic evidence clearly identifies these figures as soldiers. The centurions in the chora did have some troops at their disposal and there were certainly troops in the watch towers of the Thaaid supervising the local levies. It is this group of troops which the soldier in Apuleius and in Corinth represent.

A final source of information which must be considered are the documents which emanated from the bureaucracy of the Roman army. These documents are not the gold mine for the historian interested in the daily function of the Roman army that they might have been expected to be. The major areas where papyrus has been preserved in Egypt do not seem to
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have included the bureaucratic centres of the Roman forces. A large centre for the activities of the troops was the fort outside Alexandria at Nikopolis and no documents were preserved in that area. There is no archive that could compare to that found at Dura in volume or in quality. The nature of the documentation again causes something of a problem since, as it was meant for the record offices of the unit, it details no more than was necessary for the informed contemporary reader.

The majority of our information of this type comes in fact from one papyrus from the Geneva collection. This papyrus contains several key texts for our understanding of the Roman army in Egypt. The verso contains a duty roster of what appears to be a legionary century, or part of a legionary century, detailing the duties assigned to thirty-seven men over a ten day period probably in A.D. 90-95. It also has a summary of the strength of the century. The recto contains a list of duties outside the camp of four soldiers over a five or six year period, a list of Roman citizens, probably legionaries, from A.D. 90, and the pay records of two legionaries. The main part of the document as preserved is the verso which seems to be one document. The documents on the recto seem to have been cannibalised to make this duty roster. The summary of strength ends leaving thirty-one soldiers unaccounted for. These soldiers formed
the bulk of the troops in the duty roster which was attached to the bottom of the strength report. The extra six soldiers were added at the bottom of the report in a different hand and probably represent a change in the garrison from the beginning of the period covered. Fink suggests that the unit involved is the III Cyrenaica but the reading is uncertain and the significance of the attestation even more so. The document only becomes readable with confidence in the second column of the strength report. The column starts with the running total of those not accounted for as being forty. It then lists those exempted from work: a custos armorum, a guard of the armoury or even, possibly, the armourer; a conductor porcius, who was probably in charge of the meat supplies for the unit; carrarius Plotinus, which should probably be seen as service with the cart driver Plotinus since the names of the soldiers do not appear in this list; a secutor of the tribune Iulius Severus, a bodyguard; a guard of the house of an officer who is probably a tribune; two soldiers sent to the librarius and another officer; a supernumerary; and someone who has to stand guard at a statio. This leaves thirty one men to be found duties and these men appear in the duty roster. This document suffers from a level of abbreviation in the entries which makes it very difficult to ascertain what they were supposed to be doing. Many of the duties are simply vacant and thirty-seven of the squares, 10% of the possible total, simply have a
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dash or bar through the square. Three of the soldiers seem to leave during the month. C. Iulius Longus went out to somewhere now lost in a lacuna, as is the destination of Marius Clemens. M. Domitius went to the granary at Neapolis. Soldiers are given duties at the armoury. Others are sent "ballio" which could be "to the baths". Some of the duties appear to be guarding various parts of the camp: the headquarters, the gates, possibly the back streets. Others may have gone further afield. One goes to the insula in the first entry of the document and does not again reappear. One might have been sent to the arena for some reason. Another may be sent off to Alexandria. One duty on the list was "pazano cultus". The soldier may have been about to attend a local temple or ceremony of some kind, although a more usual version would translate the phrase as in plain clothes. Another guarded the road to Nikopolis presumably from Alexandria. Many of the duties seem to have involved attaching the troops to other officers. A speculator, a tribune, the centurions Belius and Serenus, the decurion(? ) Decrus and a beneficiarius of the prefect, possibly in charge of supplies, are all mentioned. Some duties seem to involve being "in the century" which might suggest that they were with the centurion as aides. Interpretation of such a document, existing in its virtual isolation is extremely difficult.

Page 202
Moving from the verso to the recto of P.Gen.Lat 1, the activities of four soldiers are presented in more detail. These activities occurred between 80 and 37. The duties were quite short, between three and six months as far as can be ascertained, and with three duties in six years the work load does not appear to have been excessive. M. Papirius Rufus guarded the granary at Neapolis, the granary of Mercury, and the granary of Mercury again. T. Flavius, in contrast to the granary expert was sent to build a harbour, then out with the centurion Timinius, and then out with Maximus the freedman [of Augustus?]. Another T. Flavius went out to make paper, to the mint, to the granary of Mercury, and to the _chora_. T. Flavius Celer went out to the granary at Neapolis, with the river guard, and with the grain.

The documents then present us with problems. We may wonder how typical they were of Roman service. After all the century, if that is what it was, seems to have only had forty men in the camp at the beginning of the month of which several are on fixed duties elsewhere with the cart man etc. and some of those forty exited during the month or were sent to other centurions and officers. If a third or a half of the men were out of the camp, was this the usual position or did it only happen in unusual circumstances? The career records of the four legionaries might suggest that they spent most of their time within the camp. The records deal
with the brief periods they spent away. They are not career records as such but are probably records of service away from the unit. I think it would be dangerous to place too much emphasis on them since we are unaware of what precisely were the grounds for including these activities and presumably omitting others. The duty roster has more weight since it is clear what its function was. This record suggests that a large proportion of the troops were away from the camp for considerable periods and even those who were based at the camp started were liable for daily duties outside the camp.

Another document of some interest to us is the list of hay receipts issued by the decurion L. Iulius Serenus to the horsemen of the ala veterana Gallica. These receipts tell us not just who was leaving the camp but when and to where they were going and thus provide us with a valuable source of information. The receipts are dated to the first three months of 179. Serenus seems to have been in charge of the hay allowances for all the ala. There are nineteen known decurions attested for the unit to whose troops Serenus gives the hay allowance. The attested troops however, only represent about 10% of the total number of troops in the ala. They go to twelve stations: Aparodito, Taposiris, Mareote, Skenai Mandrai, Skene Megale, Skene, Boukolia, Skenai Mikrai, Arsinoite, Laura, Klysma, and just marched...
out. This is an immense geographical spread from the Red Sea to the Fayum to the borders of Alexandria. The ala was clearly thinly spread. The dispersal of the horsemen does not appear to be "rational" in the document. The troops are not dispatched at the same point to the same place nor do the turmae seem to add any pattern to the receipts. This warns us against being too systematic in our approach to the document. The fact that only 10% of the troops leave during this period should not suggest that the other 90% were still in the camp. The level of dispersal is instructive.147

The information from the military records tends to allow us to develop a picture of a Roman army which was not tied to the camp. It is an army that sends a large proportion of its resources to the countryside. It is involved with a multiplicity of tasks, some to do with its own survival and upkeep, others to do with the grain supply, others to do with guard duties. Careful attention to the detail shows us an army that is spread across the *chora*. The evidence complements the material that has been collected elsewhere. The activities of the Roman army in the policing of the empire hardly appears in the more conventional source material and so has been overlooked by most historians. The papyrological evidence has obvious areas of weakness in its distribution and nature but the use of this evidence has created a picture that is coherent even if the picture of a
Roman army neatly spread across the Empire in strategic points, with highly-trained, centralised forces ready to cope with an invasion, according to some master plan must be replaced with a less neat, less "modern" scheme. The centurions in the nomes could be seen as the key figures in the analysis. Although they do not fit into the pattern of local administration with anything like comfort, their presence is clearly important. Like much of what we have seen of the Roman army, it was not systematized or clearly defined by those involved and almost certainly evolved over time. They were active in the *chora* but may not have had much to do with the city of Alexandria, though the evidence from that city is not of the same quality, and this involvement with the rural areas helps explain the evidence we have considered from elsewhere in the empire. As people of influence in the rural areas, a host of semi-official tasks accrued to these centurions. The evidence of the petitions concentrates on the crime related functions of the troops but we should not overlook the importance of taxes and the grain supply in the military records. The prefects did not want to see revenue or the grain supply threatened and the relatively close, if informal, control of the *chora* exercised by the centurions must reflect this. The petitions demonstrate the importance of the personal power of the centurion in contrast to the legal power of the magistrates but the contrast is an entirely modern one. These high
status figures cooperated with the local administration and naturally undertook judicial and administrative functions. There is no clash between the military and the civilian spheres of interest nor between the different bases of the power of the stratēgos and the centurion. Both seem to have accepted their respective authority. This is a feature of ancient society where social power and prestige and access to power were far more important than administrative etiquette or legal divisions. Their position within the local administration is only the one side of the equation; the other is the official view which sent these officers to these areas in the first place. This must have something to do with the patterns of disorder within rural society. The distinction between crime, banditry, and revolt was unclear. The centurion, either by himself or with a small body of troops would have acted as an early warning system for major disturbances and would have put an end to minor ones before they got out of hand. They were the first line of the Roman imperial security system.

The army in Egypt was a scattered force fulfilling many different functions. The centurions kept order in the nomes, the soldiers watched the Eastern desert in the company of the local militia in watch towers and small forts. In the South there was a border garrison, probably occupied with many of the same routine, boring tasks that
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seem to have occupied the men of the Eastern desert. Soldiers worked in quarries extracting marble and guarded the grain up the Nile for shipping to the great cities of the Mediterranean. They were involved in building projects, roads across the desert, bridges, and civic buildings as well as their own military constructions. Many of its activities must be lost with the destruction of the evidence. In the last chapters I have outlined the army’s place in society, its policing functions, military functions, and other aspects of its role. The army was not just a body of professional soldiers awaiting a major war, but was clearly involved in the everyday life of the country at a very low level of society. In the next chapters I will move away from these considerations of the army as an institution to look at the members, and especially the ex-members, of that institution and their place in Egyptian society.
The problems of the recruitment and the settlement of Roman troops have been the subject of several large scale studies.\(^1\) These have concentrated on the epigraphic material which is not plentiful for Egypt. There are a few important inscriptions of sufficient length to allow conclusions to be drawn about the origins of legionaries but these are not necessarily representative and there is very little evidence about the origins of the auxiliaries. The settlement of veterans is much better attested, indeed veterans appear frequently in the papyrological record. It is far more difficult to assess the quality and meaning of this evidence. Both elements of this study present different problems but there is clear case for considering the two problems together since it has long been considered that the sons of soldiers and veterans were likely candidates for military service. Some authors have gone so far as to suggest that the army developed into a military caste with soldiers settling in the frontier regions and the next generation of the troops being recruited from their sons.\(^2\) It is with this in mind that I turn to the evidence concerning recruitment.
The evidence for the recruitment of soldiers to the legions in Egypt is mainly epigraphic. From the middle of the first century, as I have argued, there is the Koptos inscription which lists the origins of 36 legionaries from both the legions serving in Egypt in that period. There are two relevant inscriptions from the second century. An inscription of 194 records the origins of legionaries discharged from II Traiana in that year. The number of readable origins amounts to 38. The second inscription dates from 157 and is currently in the gardens of the Museum in Alexandria. This inscription gives 133 identifiable origins. To these inscriptions we can add a number of inscriptions, mostly funerary, which detail the origins of the legionaries. The numbers of origins attested are very small but sufficient to allow some calculations. For the first century, Egypt itself provided about 23% of soldiers, mostly from Alexandria, whilst Asia Minor contributed about 57%. Gaul and Italy provide 7% as does Syria. The rest come from Cyrene, Cyprus and Africa. For the second century the numbers of attested origins are higher and show distinct changes. Egypt provided about 16%, but Asia Minor provided only around 7%. Syria, including Judaea provided about 13% whilst Italy provided about 9%. Africa provided around 54%. The main feature of the change is the decline of Asia Minor as a recruiting area and the rise of Africa. The figures are not as clear cut as at first appears. The evidence of the
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inscription of 157 shows a large number of Westerners in the legion. This evidence contrasts to the material from elsewhere in the eastern Empire which shows a relative decline in the Western element. The presence of Italians in the legion is even more unusual as Italians were rare in any unit except the newly raised. The soldiers were recruited in 132, a time of great disturbance in the east due to the troubles in Judaea and it may be that the Italians represent an extraordinary levy to reinforce the legions of the east at this time. If we were to ignore this inscription and consider only the inscription of 194 we would see a shift to local recruitment. Twenty-nine out of the thirty-nine veterans came from Egypt.

The evidence for auxiliary recruitment is even harder to assess. The auxiliaries mainly appear as veterans involved in their local communities and many of them appear to have sprung from those communities originally. However, the evidence is geographically biased and it would be unsafe to use this evidence for any statistical analysis. The auxiliaries did not produce the same kind of epigraphic material as made this kind of analysis possible for the legionaries and historians have traditionally concentrated upon the legions. It seems reasonable to assume that what was true for the legions was probably true for the auxiliaries. There is one document that urges caution. It is
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a list of receipts for money deposited by a batch of new recruits to I Lusitanorum in 117. The recruits numbered 126 and all came from Asia. 117 was a time of disturbance in Egypt which probably disrupted normal patterns of recruitment but there is a limit to how much evidence we can ignore on these grounds. Quite clearly practice varied considerably from time to time. Everyday recruitment from the Egyptian population almost certainly was the easiest way to keep the numbers of soldiers up but if there was a need for a major recruiting drive, which must have happened quite often, the officers probably turned to other areas. The troops gathered for the II Traiana from the West may well represent central government intervention and troops might have been regularly recruited in regions which did not have to supply the needs of military forces stationed in their own province. Custom must also have had some role to play in this. It is clear that we are not dealing with a regular system. All the evidence suggests that recruitment was from many different sources in many different areas and hard and fast rules cannot be deduced.

Turning to the opposite end of the careers of the soldiers, there is an increase in the quality of the evidence. The practice of the republic and early principate seems to have been to settle veterans on plots of land. The communities that then came into existence were given the
status of *coloniae* which meant that they were self-regulating city states on the Roman model. These settlements were created in the provinces as cultural bastions and secure defensive resources. Colonies were also created in areas which had recently been vacated by sizeable Roman forces and which probably had already had a large number of veterans settled in the area. There is no evidence for a settlement of this type in Egypt but the word "koloneia" does appear in the papyri. The first mention of *koloneia* comes in a land register from the village of Naboo in the Apollonopolite Heptakomias and dates from A.D.118. The key part of the text is lost in a lacuna but it appears that there was a type of colonial land which was a sub-division of klerouchic land. The next appearance of the word comes in a Fayum papyrus which is too badly damaged to make much sense. The *koloneia* may be a topographical reference point. There is one other document from the Fayum that makes mention of such a place and that is a copy of a petition of Iulius Valerius, veteran, made to the prefect in 200-3. In this petition he complains about the behaviour of another veteran M.Aurelius Neferatus. On discharge from the army Valerius had received some land near the village of Kerkesoucha in the Herakleides district of the Arsinoite nome. After considerable labour and expense, he dug an irrigation ditch to this land. Neferatus seems then to have denied access to the water and the whole episode came to
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blows in the "kolonia". Two documents from the Oxyrhynchite nome make use of the word. The first is dated to 162-3 and is an account of the trial resulting from a mortgage on property of Iulius Voltinus which was seized by Sempronius Orestinus. The seizure may also have occurred in the koloneia. The final document is probably second-century and refers to marginal land purchased by M. Iulius Valerianus in the koloneia near the village of Senepta. The verso of the document is a list of land purchases made from the state by Greco-Egyptians.

The evidence is not immediately comprehensible in the terms of the colonial settlements known from the literary and archaeological sources. The use of the word in the Egyptian context seems to refer to either a type of land or a place. The land appears to be marginal. The Senepta reference classifies the land as hupologos which suggests that it was marginal. The land in the 141 Fayum reference is associated with desert. The travails of Iulius Valerius suggest that the land that he had been granted, and he refers to the generosity of the emperors, was not of the best quality. The land is clearly associated with veterans although the list of purchasers on the verso of the Oxyrhynchite document might suggest that the land was offered to the non-veteran population as well. It seems clear then that the authorities were trying to bring
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marginal land into cultivation by granting it to veterans either free of charge or at a reduced price. The colonial land would then become a sub-division of klerouchic land and was perhaps taxed at a reduced rate. It is clear that the settlements in some areas were geographical concentrated enough to allow the term koloneia to have a distinct topographical meaning, yet the size of these settlements was small. Kerkesoucha in the Herakleides district was swallowed up administratively by its neighbouring village, Karanis. Senepta was described as a village which had this settlement in its territory and the amount of land grouped under the colonial heading in the village of Naboo cannot have been great. It is clear that the numbers of veterans who benefited from the imperial generosity in these areas must have been quite small and that the settlements do not correspond in size, grandeur or function to the more normally recognised settlements of the Roman empire. The name was probably used because this was a veteran settlement and should not be taken to imply any kind of legal status similar to that enjoyed by the cities of the rest of the empire.

The only case in Roman Egypt of the deliberate creation of a city was the foundation of the city of Antinoopolis by Hadrian. The city was founded after the death of Antinoos, Hadrian's favourite, by drowning in the
Nile, on Hadrian's visit to Egypt. The youth drowned opposite the established city of Hermopolis Magna but Hadrian decided to build a new city on the opposite bank of the Nile to Hermopolis. In H. I. Bell's view "the city was to be a bulwark of Hellenism in Middle Egypt". 17 The city was known as Antinoopolis of the New Hellenes and enrolled the most fiercely Greek groups in the whole of Egypt, a practice that accords with Hadrian's well known philo-Hellenic tendencies. 18 Bell argued that veterans were not admitted into the citizenship until the reign of Antoninus Pius from when many of the veterans who appear in the Fayum appear to enjoy both Roman and Antinoopolite citizenship. 19 However, the privileges granted to the citizenry of the new city were remarkably similar to those enjoyed by the veterans of the army. 20 Also, it seems as if some of the veterans were enrolled as citizens. C. Valerius Chairemonianus was a veteran and Antinoopolite in 148. 21 In 133 his son was active in Karanis, raising a loan with the help of two veterans Longinus Priscus and L. Octavius. 22 Longinus Priscus appears as an Antinoopolite during the reign of Pius. 23 Neither of these cases are quite conclusive. It is possible that there was a second Longinus Priscus as the combination is quite common and although Chairemonianus was an Antinoopolite in 148, his status in 133 may not have been the same since his discharge from the army might have occurred in the intermediate period and his status would
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thus have changed. More telling is the case of C. Domitius Clemens, veteran, who witnessed the opening of a will at Karanis in 131.\(^{24}\) In 155, Domitius Clemens appeared in a list of witnesses for a declaration of status involving C. Iulius Niger and his son C. Iulius Longinus. All the witnesses to the list were Antinoopolites.\(^{25}\) These cases suggest that veterans were enrolled as Antinoopolites in the years 130-8 as part of the initial founding citizenship body.

To suggest that many of the veterans were enrolled as citizens of Antinoopolis and that some veterans were part of the initial foundation of the city does not solve the problem of why the veterans were enrolled. It is possible that the particular veterans were anyhow part of the Greek groups who formed the basis of Hadrian's new city and the popular phrase "veteran and Antinoite" might point to the designations being fundamentally different. But even so the numbers of veterans who seem to have had Antinoopolite citizenship in the mid- to late second century makes it unlikely that all of these were of those special status groups and thus it seems that at least some of the veterans were enrolled because of their veteran status. We do not know enough about the city to enable us to come to any conclusions as to how long this policy was continued or whether the citizenship rolls were closed when a certain
Recruitment and Veteran Settlement

number had been reached. It appears certain that Antinoopolis was not designed as a veteran colony and perhaps the links between veterans and the city may best be interpreted as an example of some veterans exercising their influence in order to gain access to privileges and to increase their status.

These two problems raise the whole question of the control by the authorities of the process of veteran settlement. In the above discussion the motives for the state in controlling veteran settlement are clear. They needed land brought back into production to increase revenue and Hadrian wanted his new city to have citizens. The temptations for the veterans are also clear: land and privileges. The documentation on the processes of demobilization, namely the auxiliary diploma, does not make any mention of possible settlement procedures though we would not necessarily expect it to.26 The only documents which do suggest that there was some supervision of the settlement of veterans are the epikrisis documents. These follow set patterns in our period for this type of examination. The documents we have are copies taken from the book of the prefect recording the examination. They list the groups that are eligible for examination: Alexandrians, Romans, veterans of the alae, cohorts and the fleets, and freedmen. In addition some of the documents mention other
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groups: the veterans and those veterans "without the bronze". 27 Documentation is produced for the judge, normally a senior military official, as are witnesses to the status of the person involved and there is a statement either of residence or, in the case of veterans, of intended residence. They differ from the normal epikrisis documents in being related to adults and in being supervised by officials who were officiating on behalf of the prefect but they still appear to be documents meant to establish citizenship status within the civilian community. It seems that there was a discrepancy between the date of examination and the date of discharge from the army. 28 It may be that the discrepancy is explainable by institutional factors and that there was a cycle of epikrisis but the evidence is not clear. Veterans would have needed to establish their legal status at discharge and perhaps the documentation that we have represents the veterans trying to sort out problems. If the veteran was to change his place of residence or was faced with questions as to his status, the examination would solve his problems. We may also note that the examination also established the other rights of the veteran and his family. It does seem that the veteran had to give his administrative district. This may have been so that the administrator could contact the appropriate strategos to inform him of the result of the examination. It should not surprise us that the veteran community had to register their
residence since the rest of the Egyptian population was to a certain extent tied to their *origo*. However, it is clear that although the veterans had to register their residence and that presumably the administration were capable of calculating the number of veterans in an area or forcibly settling veterans in a particular area, they do not seem to have done so.²⁹

The study of the available documentation above, does not suggest that the Roman authorities would usually control the process of veteran settlement in Egypt. The veterans seem to have been allowed to settle where they wished though like other groups in Egypt the authorities did register their residence. In the rhetoric of population shift, it seems that the push factors regulating the settlement of veterans were negligible. It remains to consider the pull factors which must have determined the settlement areas of veterans.

The generally accepted position in the modern literature is that the pull factors were negligible as well. Veterans tended to settle near to their camps.³⁰ The motivation for such conservatism is clear. The soldier had spent his career in the environs of the camp and had built ties of friendship and family in the area. The unofficial
wives almost certainly lived in the canabae of the camp which rapidly became, in the West at least, flourishing towns. It is also possible that the soldiers grew used to the military ethos of these areas and sought to stay near the camp. The parallel development in this period of a greatly increased number of men recruited to the legions who were ex castris, i.e. born in the immediate environs of the camp to serving soldiers and thus technically illegitimate meant that the military could be seen as a geographically separated group.

Analysis of the Egyptian evidence is made more difficult since the papyrological sources illuminate middle Egypt and the Fayum but do not tell us anything about the Delta region around Nikopolis, the legionary base. The model can only be partially tested on the basis of this evidence. The material from the North-East Fayum is rich in attestations of veterans. In the period from A.D. 90 to A.D. 216, I have been able to find at least fifty soldiers or veterans attested at Karanis. It may be that some of these were passing through the town and were only briefly associated with the area but most seem to have had familial connections with the area or have been veterans. Many of the documents from the North-East Fayum were discovered by the Sebakhin and thus have no secure provenance. It would be possible to supplement the list by considering the veterans
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attested at Philadelphia and the neighbouring settlement of Bakchias since both communities seem to have been equally rich in veterans.

### Military Personnel of Karanis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amatius Priscus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>c.150</td>
<td>P.Kar.Goodsp. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Anthestius Gemellus</td>
<td>Coh. III Itur.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>P.Mich. IX 568-559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Anthestius Gemellus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>172/3</td>
<td>SB V 7558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonius Tiberianus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>P.Lond. II p.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonius son of Apollonius</td>
<td>Coh. Ulp. Afrorum</td>
<td>II?</td>
<td>BGU I 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aurelius Iulius Ptolemaios</td>
<td>Ala Gall.</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>BGU II 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassianus Gemellus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>P.Wisc. II 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor</td>
<td>Eques</td>
<td>172/3</td>
<td>P.Mich. IV 224, 4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Terentianus</td>
<td>Vet. Leg. III Cyr.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>See Ch XI p.314f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Tiberianus</td>
<td>Leg.</td>
<td>I/II</td>
<td>See Ch XI p.314f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Domitius Clemens</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>CPL 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fabullius Macer</td>
<td>Vet. Misen. Fleet.</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>P.Lond. II 229, BGU I 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horis son of Horion</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>173/4</td>
<td>P.Mich. IV 225, 2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidoros</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>173/4</td>
<td>P.Mich. IV 224, 4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ision</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>173/4</td>
<td>P.Mich. IV 224, 6252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Agrippianus</td>
<td>Ala Apriana</td>
<td>c.120 BGU</td>
<td>I'69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Agrippianus</td>
<td>Leg. II Tr.</td>
<td>147-8 BGU</td>
<td>XI 2012-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Apollinarius</td>
<td>Leg.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>See Ch.XI p.311f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Apollinarius</td>
<td>Coh. I Apam.</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>BGU III 729;888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Apollinarius</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>BGU I 168.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Clemens</td>
<td>Cent. Leg. XXII</td>
<td>117-38</td>
<td>P. Mich. VIII 483-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Gemellus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>189-94</td>
<td>BGU I 326.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Niger</td>
<td>Vet. Ala Gall.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>See Ch.XI p.296f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Sabinus</td>
<td>Leg III Cyr I/II</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Ch.XI p.311f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Saturninus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>BGU I 300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longinus</td>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>169-77</td>
<td>P. Lond. II p.172 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Longinus Aquila</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>BGU I 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Longinus Apollinarius</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>BGU I 327.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Longinus Castor</td>
<td>Vet. Fleet</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>BGU I 326.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longinus Clemens</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>P. Mich. VIII 489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Longinus Priscus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>BGU II 581.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Octavius Longus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>BGU II 581.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Olius Maximus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>P. Oxf. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Petronius</td>
<td>Leg.?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>P. Oslo. I 33.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Sempronius Clemens</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>BGU I 300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Sempronius Gemellus</td>
<td>Leg III Cyr 95</td>
<td>P.Lond. II p.203/142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sempronius Hermeinus</td>
<td>Ala Maur.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>BGU II 447.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sempronius Priscus</td>
<td>Leg.</td>
<td>31-96</td>
<td>P.Mich. IX 554.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Sempronius Sabinus</td>
<td>Vet. Ala Apr 139-57</td>
<td>BGU II 645.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Sempronius Serenus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>152/3</td>
<td>BGU II 448/I 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tius</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>171/2</td>
<td>P.Mich. IV 223/1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Aphrodisus</td>
<td>Coh.eq.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>BGU II 447.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Apollinarius</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>BGU XI 2070, I 69/II 448.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Valerius Chairemonianus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>BGU I 300.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Clemens</td>
<td>Coh.II.Itur 177-88</td>
<td>SB 7332.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Paulinus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>SB VI 9636.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Valerius Serenus</td>
<td>Leg II Tr. III</td>
<td>SB III 6272/3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Vespasianus Gemellus</td>
<td>Vet.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>P.Athen. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Vibia Crispus</td>
<td>Leg.</td>
<td>81-96</td>
<td>P.Mich. IX 554.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The veterans seem to have arrived in Karanis in the Domitianic period and they seem to have been a fairly large part of the population of the village. Identification is difficult since the veterans and soldiers only identified themselves as such in some of their dealings. Quite clearly
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the veteran and soldier group in the village are under-represented in our evidence. There were a large number of people in the village and in the surrounding area who had Roman names in the second century and it is presumably immigration to the area which allowed this group to develop. The Karanis group do not seem to come from any particular units. The legions are quite well represented but there are four cohorts attested and three alae. No unit appears to have a monopoly on veteran settlement nor even to have a significantly larger element attested than any other. Some units are not attested at all but the general level of attestation is so low that it is not possible to make anything of this.

The dramatic contrast to this evidence is found in the archives at Oxyrhynchus which have produced very few attestations of veterans and few attestations of Romans, in spite of the volume of papyrological material from Oxyrhynchus exceeding that of both Karanis and Philadelphia combined. Although the documentation from the two sites differs in character it is possible to suggest that the percentage of the population of the Oxyrhynchite who had military connections was between a tenth and a twentieth of that at Karanis in the second century, a figure that appears quite reasonable when we look at the Roman element in the Oxyrhynchite compared to that at Karanis and recent work on
the extensive material at Soknopaiou Nesos suggests that that village had a very small Roman element. The comparison of Karanis with other similar areas at similar times shows quite clearly that the numbers of veterans settling in the area were abnormally high. Our problem then is to explain this difference.

There is no particular reason to expect more veterans at Karanis than elsewhere. There was no camp in the village at any period. Although one building in the village has been identified as a barrack block, the extremely tentative identification is almost certainly wrong. The building was large and a number of ostraka were found inside relating to the shipment of grain. There was military involvement in this activity but there was also a large number of civilians involved and it is perhaps best to see the building as a large house which perhaps served as an office for the grain supply. There seems to be no reason for a greater military involvement in the immediate area than in the Oxyrhynchite. It may be that the evidence represents rural life in the Fayum while the Oxyrhynchite material reflects a more urbanised population but it is difficult to see why this should make any difference to the numbers of Romans attested especially as the qualitative difference between residence in a nome capital and in one of the main villages of the nome can hardly have been that great in the first and second
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centuries and veteran settlement in the West has always been seen as a cause of urbanisation. There is no evidence that veterans preferred rural to urban environments.

Lewis's publication of a letter requesting that a soldier's brother offer help and hospitality to a veteran thinking of moving to the village would help to explain part of the problem. The veteran was moving to the village not for any strong reason but because it seemed as good a place as any and he had an initial introduction. It suggests that the numbers of veterans could have increased because of the good publicity attaching to the area from earlier settlers. The Fayum appears in Strabo as one of the richest and most fertile regions of Egypt and the archaeological reports suggested that Karanis grew rapidly in the first century. However, the image of the veteran entrepreneur casing in on a booming village and helping the economic growth in the region is unconvincing. The veterans arrived late in the process of development. The first veterans seem to appear under Domitian and the bulk of the evidence comes from the second century. This may be because the papyrological material from Karanis is so slight for the first century but there are a lot of ostraka for that period. The ostraka are numerous in the first and third centuries and show nothing like the numbers of veterans attested in the papyrological evidence. The economic
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development of the period cannot be related to the arrival of veteran settlers. Lewis shows how the momentum of settlement could be maintained but not why settlement started in the first place and to change the problem to one of recruitment by saying that the veterans were returning home is unsatisfactory since it still leaves the problem of why soldiers were recruited from this district. 37

The accepted model of recruitment and settlement is drawn almost entirely from the legionary epigraphic material but for Egypt this model does not provide clear explanations. It is clear from the previous chapters that the army was dispersed within Egypt. We see in the Karanis evidence and elsewhere that the veterans did not regularly state which unit they had been discharged from. It would seem from this that the unit they had belonged to was not of great importance to them. The privileges and status of veterans of all arms of the service were similar. 38 It also suggests that the loyalty of individuals to their unit was probably not great and if the extreme model of unit dispersal is adhered to, this is explained since the troops were as likely to serve with troops from other units as their own. If this was so, we can hardly expect the soldiery in general to have had close emotional or other ties to an individual area. In Egypt then, the pattern of settlement or recruitment might well reflect this. The veterans would
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settle in a much more uncontrolled and dispersed fashion than the accepted model suggests. This relied upon the epigraphic sources but the erection and preservation of epigraphic material is not a random matter. It is clear that there was an epigraphic habit and it is conceivable that the preservation of the material is also a distorting factor in analyses. When the volume of material is so slight such distortions may have a great effect, particularly if limited epigraphic material is also used to establish legionary or unit bases. It may be that more inscriptions were put up and have been preserved and discovered near large legionary camps than elsewhere and this might not be related to the patterns of settlement. The papyrological evidence suggests that patterns of recruitment and settlement were complex.

The evidence does suggest that there was a gradual shift towards local recruitment and that a large number of soldiers probably settled in the province in which they served. We can also say with some confidence that there was little attempt by the Roman authorities to regulate the settlement of veterans. We are hampered in our researches by the geographically limited nature of the source material. It may be that the evidence from Karanis reflects the position in the Delta or in the Memphite region but we do not have the necessary documentation to prove this. Veterans did tend to settle together in communities but they seem to have made
up only a small proportion of the population of the villages. We can see quite clearly that veteran settlement was not in a military context such as canabae. It is impossible to reach any firm conclusions as to why there was a concentration of veteran settlement in the North-East Fayum but it is not difficult to work out combinations of events which could start such a process off which could not possibly be reflected in the source material and more properly belong to the realms of fiction. Once a number of veterans were established in the area, or a number of recruits drawn from the area, custom and tradition could assert itself and it is worth emphasising the complexity of the processes that were at work. It is impossible to assess how unusual this region was or how significant the settlement was but the rise of the veterans of the region rather confuses a neat and persuasive and well-established, general model.
The Pay of the Roman Army

There have been a large number of studies concerned with the problem of army pay. These studies culminated in the essay of Speidel in 1973 which seems to have led to a reasonable consensus. However, since the publication of this article another document of interest and relevance has emerged and it now seems worth a brief re-examination of the evidence concerning pay in the first two centuries A.D. Throughout the following discussion I will use stipendium to describe an instalment of annual pay.

Suetonius, describing events in Gaul, tells us that Julius Caesar doubled the pay of the soldiers for all time. The clear implication of this is that although the initial increase in pay to the troops was a personal gesture, probably due to the vast amounts of booty accumulated by Caesar during his invasion and conquest of Gaul, it became a permanent and general state of affairs after Caesar's victories in the civil wars. Since the pay of the Republican soldier had been 120 denarii, this implies that pay was raised to 240, but Tacitus informs us, referring to events of A.D. 14, that the soldiers were paid ten asses per day which would suggest an annual rate of 225 denarii. The
language of Suetonius is evidently a little loose when describing this increase in salaries. The next increase in pay came with the reign of Domitian and is linked with the aftermath of the revolt of the legions on the German frontier under L.Antonius Saturninus. Domitian added a quartum stipendium which translates most naturally as a "fourth stipendium" to the pay of the army. Dio contradicts this by saying that for the 75 drachmas per stipendium that had been paid before Domitian, 100 was paid afterwards. The discrepancy seems to be reasonably easily resolved. The basic agreement about an increase is clear and it is surely an over zealous reading of Suetonius to see a real division of opinion. The total amount of money was what was important and to say that Domitian increased the money by the monetary value of a stipendium surely does not demand the interpretation, contrary to the more specific Dio, that Domitian added another pay day. The final increase in pay attested in our period is an increase under Septimius Severus dated to after the revolt of Albinus and so to around 197. Herodian tells us that "He gave much money to the soldiers and many other things which they had not had before". The survey of the literary evidence points to pay in the imperial period being paid in three stipendia of 75 denarii before Domitian increased pay to a total of 300 denarii, in three stipendia a year. Pay was then increased in 197.
The best evidence from Egypt consists of three documents: Fink 68 = P.Gen.Lat 1 recto part 1; Fink 69 = P.Gen.Lat. 4; Fink 70 = P.Berol inv. 6866 + P.Aberd. 133. The first of these documents is relatively clear. It is the accounts of two soldiers, Q. Iulius Proculus from Damascus and C. Iulius Germanus from Tyre. The tria nomina and the origins suggest strongly that these men served in the legion and the other documents on P.Gen.Lat. 1 all come from the record office of III Cyrenaica. The accounts list withdrawals from each stipendium of 247½ drachmas. The third and final stipendium of the year had reductions from it in the accounts of both soldiers amounting to the exact total of the stipendium. Over the year, Proculus managed to save 207 drachmas whereas Germanus was only able to save 167 drachmas. The only difference in the two accounts is the level of deposit that both start off with, Proculus was wealthier, and a payment for clothing in the first period amounted to 100 drachmas in the case of Germanus but only 60 for Proculus. This strongly suggests that the expenses were standardised. The document has a consular date of A.D. 81 and therefore dates from before the Domitianic increase in pay.

Fink 70 is an account of a single stipendium to a group of soldiers. This document has consular dates in it but these refer to the date of enlistment of the individual soldier. The earliest date is 172 and the latest is 192,
although the document is incomplete. Assuming that the soldiers served for twenty-five or twenty-six years then the latest possible date for it would be 198 but as the document is incomplete it seems safer to date it to before the increase in pay in 197 and Fink argues convincingly for 192. These entries differ from the previous records in that the soldiers withdrew their money after deductions and it was not put on deposit. These soldiers are paid the distinctly odd sum of 84 denarii 15½ obols. The names contain some which appear to be Roman but others have clear patronymics and seem to be Greek. Therefore, the accounts probably refer to auxiliary troops.

The third document, Fink 69, is by far the most incomplete but in spite of this, or rather perhaps because of this, a lot has been made to stand on its interpretation. The document is a Latin account and a centurion sign, which does not occur in Fink 68, confirms the military context of the document. It looks very similar in lay out to Fink 68 but unlike that document this is clearly not a fair copy of an account. There are corrections within the account and although the arithmetic of the first portion is clear, the calculations in the second part are more difficult and by the third segment, there seems to be a real problem which the original editor solved by departing from the pattern established by the previous segments but which on Fink's
reading is impossible to do. The document does not follow the practice in Fink 68 of giving a running total of the amount in the deposit bank after the deductions from each stipendium. There is no clear evidence to date the text though the hand shows similarities to Fink 68. Although there are similarities with Fink 68, 69 remains something of an enigma. If the document is to be interpreted as a similar document to Fink 68, then the stipendium paid to the soldier was 297 drachmas and this was paid at least three times in the document. There is a possible fourth stipendium but this occurs right at the end of the text, is a dubious reading, in a dubious context, and may, in any case, in a document as carelessly constructed as this, refer to the following year. This is not good evidence for a fourth stipendium.

The amounts of the stipendia are a cause for some concern. If we were to convert Fink 68 into denarii per year, we would reach a total of 185.625 denarii. This is achieved by $247\frac{1}{2} \times 3 =$ yearly pay, which is then converted into denarii by dividing by four which is the rate of exchange between Egyptian drachmas and denarii. Speidel, however, pointed out that $247\frac{1}{2}$ was 99% of 250 which was $\frac{5}{6}$ of the real legionary stipendium of 300 drachmas or 75 denarii.\textsuperscript{8} The ingenuity of this rather collapses when faced with Fink 70 since a similar procedure using the post-87 rate of 300 denarii would produce a figure of 82.5 denarii.
for each stipendium and if the 1% was not deducted would lead to a figure of 83.33' denarii. Speidel also interpreted Fink 69 as a reduction of 1% from 300 drachmas which would convert on the basis of four stipendia each year to 1200 drachmas or 300 denarii per year. Speidel is then able to suggest that the full pay here enjoyed means that the recipient here was a legionary and the others were auxiliaries whose pay was about 5/6 the legionary pay. Speidel's argument works perfectly well if there were only three stipendia in the document since this would give an annual total of 900 drachmas or 225 denarii, the pre-87 level though Speidel does believe that the document dates to a period after the increase.

The publication in 1989 of documents from Masada has produced another document relevant to pay. This is a document very much of the same type as Fink 68 but far more complete than Fink 69. It details the deductions from the stipendium of C. Messius C.f.. He is certainly a legionary. The document has a fragmentary consular date which would suggest A.D. 72 or possibly A.D. 76. Messius receives in the period that the document covers two stipendia which are 50 denarii and, in the second period, 60 denarii. All of this money may have been used up in the expenses of the camp. The irregularity of the sum from which the stipendium has implications for the reconstruction of Fink 69 but it seems
clear that a proportion of the actual stipendium is what the soldier used to meet the costs of camp. This interpretation is unavoidable in the Masada text and immediately clears up some of the problems with the other texts. Fink 68, with the stipendium of 247½ drachmas, has both soldiers incur expenses in the third segment of exactly the amount of the stipendium paid over to the camp. Now, if this was their only income, a soldier would hardly be able to support any of his other various activities. The papyri are full of occasions when the soldiers are lending money, buying things, keeping slaves, buying slaves and supporting a family. It would be unlikely that the soldier could support all these activities from other sources of income. The 247½ was then a figure which represents the maximum regular expenditure of the soldier in camp and although it must reflect pay, pay cannot be straightforwardly calculated from these figures.¹⁰

Still, the problem of the larger amounts credited to the account of the soldier in Fink 69 has to be examined. Quite clearly he must be earning more than the soldiers of Fink 68 since the amount from which deductions are made is greater by around 50 drachmas. If there are only three payments reflected in the document and if the document is later than Domitian's increase in the pay, then each stipendium was worth 400 drachmas and he was paying 74.25%
to the camp authorities. If there were four stipendia, which is extremely unlikely, or the document refers to pre-increase period, he was paying 99% to the camp authorities, assuming standard payment. The figures for payments made for individual items are larger than in Fink 68 which might suggest that the soldier in question had slightly greater expenses but the increase in pay under Domitian might also have been offset by an increase in camp expenses. The difference is not a real problem.

The evidence seems to suggest that the pay of the auxilia was the same as that of the legions. The two clearest documents, Fink 68 and 70, point to about the same amount of money being deducted from the stipendia of legionaries and auxiliary soldiers to meet the expenses of the camp which must be taken as suggesting that their rates of pay were similar. There is in many quarters a great reluctance to except this as a possible system of pay. Brunt, faced with this possibility, redated Fink 70 to after 197 and therefore after the increase in pay under Severus. Speidel argues that these two documents both relate to auxiliaries and that Fink 69 is the only document that refers to legionaries, although the natural conclusion to be drawn from the whole of P.Gen.Lat 1 is that all parts refer to legionaries and this includes Fink 68. Speidel saw some backing for his theory that auxiliary pay was $5/6$ of
legionary pay in the career inscription of Ti. Claudius Maximus who was transferred from being a vexillarius equitum of the legion to duplicarius of an ala. Speidel argues that this meant a rise in pay since that although the factor of cavalry pay was the same for both posts, the vexillarius received 1.5 times the normal pay and the duplicarius would have received twice the auxiliary pay which would have compensated for the fact that the pay of the auxilia was less than that of the legions. Speidel argues that this meant a rise in pay since that although the factor of cavalry pay was the same for both posts, the vexillarius received 1.5 times the normal pay and the duplicarius would have received twice the auxiliary pay which would have compensated for the fact that the pay of the auxilia was less than that of the legions. 13 Breeze has, however, demonstrated that the vexillarius received twice ordinary pay and not 1.5 times the pay, but suggests that this means that Maximus had a pay cut in being promoted. The most natural assumption must be that the transfer either led to an increase in pay or the pay being kept the same. If the pay was the same, then auxiliary pay and legionary pay were the same. 14

The literary material does not distinguish between auxiliary and legionary pay. Herodian talks of "the soldiers" as does Suetonius. The story of the demands for pay in A.D. 14 in Tacitus is directly relevant only to the legions and there is no suggestion as to what the auxiliaries were paid. The only information we have on the pay of the auxiliaries comes in the account of the revolt of the Batavians in Tacitus's Histories. The rebellion having broken out in the Batavian lands, messengers were sent to
inspire the Batavian cohorts in the army of Vitellius to revolt. As a preliminary to this they demanded an increase in the number of cavalry in their units and the doubling of their pay. The story has been taken as indicative of the comparative levels of pay of the *auxilia* and the legions. The Batavian doubling of pay, which had in fact been promised by Vitellius, would have brought their pay up to the level of legionaries and the increase in the number of auxiliary cavalry would similarly have increased their pay. Although it does seem that cavalry pay was greater than the pay of the ordinary foot soldier, it is questionable whether the evidence of the Batavians, who were under the control of their own commanders, in 69 is good evidence for the position of the auxiliaries in the later first or second century. The Batavians are clearly something of an exception in this period. The Batavian demand for higher pay need not necessarily mean that they were being paid half of the amount that was paid to the legionaries nor that the whole of the *auxilia* were paid at the same rate as the Batavians.

Pay is ultimately only important for our purposes in its relationship to the economic status of soldiers and veterans. The sums accumulated in deposit by the soldiers of Fink 68 and 70 were not particularly large. In Fink 70 the soldiers were withdrawing their excess incomes which often amounted to about 79 denarii from one *stipendium*, which
would be about 316 drachmas. In Fink 68, Proculus had an excess of 206 drachmas and Germanus had 166 but these were over a year. The changes in pay and the change in the nature of the account means that direct comparison is difficult but neither should be taken as a reflection of the savings or the annual surplus of the soldiers. They probably had other expenses to meet and it is impossible to estimate how much money they might have been able to save when they came to retire from these figures. There is, however, a summary of the accounts of the deposits of a unit, Fink 73. These include a cavalryman who had 1459 denarii on deposit which is a very large amount but is uniquely high. The amount seems to be an exception since other figures in this part of the account appear to be less than 200 denarii, though later in the document when there is a change in the pattern of the document, the monetary levels seem to increase to a maximum deposit of just under 500 denarii as attested and to have an average deposit of around 365 and a total average of 567 denarii per soldier if the various other accounts are reckoned in. This is far in excess of the other two columns and perhaps there are special circumstances effecting this account. Still, these are quite substantial amounts of money.

But it is important to see this money within the proper context. There is very little evidence for the
rewards to soldiers upon retirement, the *praemia militaria*, but there is a mention in Dio. In A.D.5, the soldiers were complaining about the poor quality of these rewards and so Augustus fixed the levels afresh at 5,000 denarii for praetorians and 3,000 for the others.\textsuperscript{16} This amount is six times the accumulated salary in the cases above and in the wider context these figures are well below the level of the equestrian census and the rich Roman and Greek aristocrats were far, far wealthier than this. However, in the terms of Egyptian village society, these are substantial sums, even if we take these figures to be indicative of the accumulated wealth of a man of 45. There is no evidence of the payment of this bonus after the Dio story and no evidence of the payment to auxiliaries though this is not evidence for the non-payment of the bonus.

The picture as it has emerged from the study of pay and the financial rewards of military service, has two clear points. The first is the most important. There is no reason to differentiate between auxiliaries and between legionaries in matters of pay and rewards for service in the period after A.D.70. The little evidence that there is points to the conclusion that they were equally well rewarded and the only real piece of evidence to suggest that they were paid half the amount paid to legionaries rests upon a group who were not only clearly organised upon distinctive lines but
were plainly untypical of the auxiliary forces as they were developing. The second point is that the pay itself was by no means vast but the retirement bonus seems to have been quite substantial. The Roman veteran was, if he was lucky enough to survive that long, in quite a reasonable financial situation as far as can be discerned from the rather unsatisfactory evidence available. This assumes, of course, that there were no substantial deductions from the 3,000 denarii, which is a rash assumption considering the level of deductions from ordinary pay and the evidence of dedications to the emperor upon discharge. But this is only relative to the generally low financial standard of contemporary Egyptian village society. In terms of the Roman elite or of the Greek elite the rewards of service were insignificant. We would expect the veterans therefore to arrive in village society as relatively rich villagers even without any real property in the village previous to discharge.
The evidence for the legal status of soldiers and veterans in the early empire is surprisingly good. One of the most important sources for legal matters is the Digest, a collection of legal rulings compiled under the patronage of the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century. The rulings are not from that period but, in general, date to the second century of our era and reflect the great era of Roman jurisprudence. The Digest is not a legal textbook or a discussion of the law but rather a series of edited summaries from the discussions of the jurists which, in their original form, must have been much fuller. The surviving rulings represent Roman law as reflected in the writings of the jurists and again filtered by the compilers of the Digest. We have just the rulings and the briefest of summaries of the reasoning. Occasionally, reference is made to an imperial edict to justify a ruling, but unfortunately for the historian this is not a common practice. This means that it is difficult to say when a certain legal position came into being since the particular jurist discussing the problem provides a terminus ante quem and not a date for the law. The writings of the jurists from which the Digest is
drawn are spread fairly evenly across the second century. Peter Garnsey sees the evolution of some of the more important ideas in the Digest as coming about by the reign of Hadrian. It seems safe to work on the assumption that the texts in the Digest probably reflect the legal position of the early to mid-second century. The Digest can be supplemented to an extent by the law codes of the later Empire. These provide comparative evidence of the way law codes worked in the ancient world. Although the law codes were not comprehensive, we are fortunate in that the legal position of soldiers was a topic of interest for the jurists.

The Egyptian evidence has produced three edicts on the privileges of veterans. The first of these was issued by Octavian. The edict is incomplete but refers to all veterans under his authority. The second edict was also a general decree on the privileges due to veterans issued by Domitian. The third edict was issued by Hadrian. This was a ruling on the military will.

Another major source of information is the veteran diploma. These diplomas first appear in the reign of Claudius, at around A.D. 54. However, the documents did not reach their "classic" form until after A.D. 70. After this date, at least one of these documents has been found for
every year until the 180s when they become less common. The series starts again in the early third century. The diploma has been seen as recording the primary grant of privileges to the auxiliary veteran. The veteran was granted *conubium*, citizenship for himself and, in the pre-144 documents, citizenship for his children.

Another source of information is the "Gnomon of the Idios Logos". The document was a collection of guide-lines issued to nome administrators and was not, therefore, comprehensive, nor was it intended to be. Much of the material covered in the Gnomon was to do with the financial and legal aspects of the various status divisions in Egypt. Many of the rulings are undated. The fullest text we have summarises rulings from the time of Augustus up to the text's compilation sometime between A.D. 151 and 160. It seems safest to use this text of the Gnomon for the second-century, unless the first-century text allow us to attribute first-century origins to specific rulings. The papyrological material dealing with veterans in Egyptian society comes mainly from the second century. There is a great deal of available information on this issue of legal status and it is spread across the period.

Some of the most discussed privileges, which appear to be unique to soldiers, are those that relate to the writing
of wills and the bequeathing of possessions. Soldiers seem to have been exempted from the normal regulations governing the form of the will. These privileges were justified, by the jurists and the emperors who granted them, because of the ignorance of the soldiery. The soldiers were allowed to ignore the complicated legal procedures necessary in Roman law for a will to be valid. Indeed, it seems that the will did not even have to be written. The clear expression of a bequest was enough for the bequest to be legally acceptable. This, of course, created certain legal problems when it came to deciding which statements of intent were acceptable and which were not, but it seems that if a soldier called together his colleagues in order to make a will there was no necessity to further formalise the proceedings. Normally, the drawing up of a will was a fairly difficult matter, requiring some specialist legal knowledge. It was comparatively easy to make a mistake and to invalidate the whole will. Each Roman will needed seven witnesses of the same citizenship status as the testator and these then had to be present at the opening of the will. There were complicated rules as to who could inherit what and what proportion of the estate could be given to whom. All these rules were waived in the case of soldiers. Privileges seem to have been granted by Julius Caesar, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian. In addition to the rules relating to the bequests of soldiers there were also special
Legal Status

privileges granted to soldiers with regard to receiving inherited property. The *pater familias* was not allowed to disinherit a son serving away from home in the time of Augustus. 8 Soldiers were in receipt of another extraordinary privilege in that they were permitted to institute *peregrini* as heirs. The measure was probably brought in by one of the Flavians. 9 This rule was extended by Hadrian in A.D. 119, an extension Hadrian represented as being extremely generous. After this, not only was a soldier able to bequeath his property to a *peregrinus* but also a peregrine child would be able to establish a legal claim to the property of the soldier-father even if his father had died intestate. The kin of the soldier, again not necessarily of the same citizenship status as the soldier, were also able to claim his property. 10 The "Gnomon of the Idios Logos" contains clauses to do with the military will: Clause 34 allows those in the army to dispose of their property in either Roman or Greek form and to use whatever words they wish, provided that the property goes to someone who is "*homophyllos*". Clause 35 states that children and kinsmen of soldiers who die intestate are permitted to inherit, provided they are of the same "*genos*". 11 At first sight, the limitation of the privilege to "those of the same tribe" seems to contrast with the limitation to "the same type" and with the rights of a soldier to make a *peregrinus* heir. Yet enabling relatives and offspring to inherit is what must have been
intended by the extension of privileges to the soldiers. Soldiers drawn from the provinces were allowed to bequeath their goods only to someone who was also drawn from the same province. Presumably, the soldier was still allowed to will his goods to fellow citizens and it is inconceivable that a soldier's offspring could not inherit by will but could do so when there was no will. So, presumably, a Roman soldier who married an Egyptian could leave property to his technically Egyptian, illegitimate offspring. In the "Gnomon of the Idios Logos", there is no mention of any time limit for privileges to do with wills but in the "Digest" the privilege is limited to the period of service and the year after discharge.

As far as I know there are no military wills of this period in the papyrological evidence from Egypt. There are, however, some wills which deal with the final requests of veterans. The will of C.Longinus Castor was made in A.D.189. He seems to have written the will, or rather had the will written, in Greek. The main beneficiaries were his two slaves, Marcella and Cleopatra. He specifically disinherits all his family, though there is a subsequent codicil in favour of his kinsman, Iulius Serenus. The will was witnessed by seven persons, all with Roman names, and, significantly, there was a legal advisor, C.Lucius Geminianus, who appears in another document of the same type
in the same role. The will of Sempronius Priscus may be the will of a veteran. He measures his estate in *iugera*, although the normal Egyptian unit for measuring land was the *aroura* (the measures are approximately of equal size). He called his daughters by Roman names which might suggest that they were citizen-women; his wife, if it is she who appears in this document, was called Thais. The witnesses to the document seem to be veterans. The will appears to be drawn up according to Roman usage. The will of Amatius Priscus was sealed when he was a serving soldier and was the subject of some dispute between his daughter and sister. The papyrus is very badly damaged and it is not possible to be precise about the legal arguments involved but it seems that his daughter won the case and we can surmise that the legitimacy of the daughter was in dispute. Her victory, sometime after 136, accords with the rulings that veterans could make their children heirs even if they did not have Roman status. The soldier's right to institute a *peregrinus* as heir is attested by a collection of cases referring to marriage in which the validity of a will was upheld in spite of a ruling against the appellants that the son was illegitimate. The will of M. Valerius Turbo is too full of lacunae to merit detailed analysis, but it is worth noting that this veteran specifically disinherited some of his children. The will of C. Iulius Diogenes, a veteran was drawn up by another veteran, C. Numissius Crispus, who may have performed the
same service for a Gemellus. This presents us with a very small group of documents to work from but they do show certain common characteristics. They show a desire to keep to the strict legal forms of the Roman will. There is evidence of a certain amount of legal expertise within the communities which produced the wills: Karanis and Philadelphia. In general, the wills seem to be written in Greek and not Latin but this may be because the documents we have are translations.

The next major group of privileges to be considered is the right of soldiers to citizenship. We know of limited grants of citizenship to soldiers who had distinguished themselves on the field of battle in the late Republic but the regular grant of citizenship to veterans of auxiliary units as attested in the diplomas was probably quite late. The first grant of extensive privileges we come across is a grant of Octavian, made in 31 B.C. This grant is not fully preserved but it is certain that all Roman soldier/veterans were confirmed in their rights as citizens and citizenship was extended to their children and possibly to their wives and parents. Certainly, the right to vote and be registered as a citizen in Rome in absentia was granted. Also granted were certain immunities from public service to be dealt with later. In the reign of Claudius some rather primitive versions of Diplomata occur but before considering the vexed
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question of the diplomas and their role, we will first turn to another major find: the Philadelphia tablet. This is a complex and again incomplete document which appears to be a dossier sent to the Prefect of Egypt by M. Valerius Quadratus, veteran of X Pretensis, the legion stationed in Judaea. It seems to include some kind of discharge certificate, a list of witnesses, a copy of a decree of the Emperor Domitian, and an appeal to the Prefect, possibly for the registration of his two sons as citizens. This is not the place to discuss what exactly the collection is intended for. The important part of the document, for our purposes, is the edict of Domitian. This edict grants citizenship to the wives and children and parents of the soldier.

The diploma was issued to soldiers of the auxiliary units who were given honourable discharge. Not only did the diploma record the honourable discharge but also citizenship rights and the privileges relating to discharge. The grant of citizenship was coupled with a grant of conubium for the wife of the soldier or the future wife of the soldier, provided he had only one. Citizenship was also granted to the children of the soldier who were already born and was assured for future children through the grant of conubium. In the earliest diplomas citizenship was granted to the descendants of the soldier as well. This would presumably cover grandchildren, born before the citizenship grant was
made. There was a change in the privileges granted to the veterans of auxiliary units between A.D. 140 and 144.22 The grant of citizenship and retrospective legitimacy to the children of soldiers born in service was withdrawn leaving only the privileges of citizenship and conubium. However, the veterans of the fleet seem to have been able to claim citizenship for their children as the veterans of the praetorians may have been able to.23 Later diplomas may have extended this further grant of citizenship to those discharged having the rank of decurion or centurion. Confusingly, diplomas granting citizenship continued to be given out after the extension of the citizenship to almost the entire population of the Empire. The diplomas were probably either used to claim other privileges due to the veterans or given to veterans who had somehow managed to avoid being given the citizenship. Conubium continued to be granted in all these diplomas.

The identification of Roman citizens in Egypt, which used to be thought a relatively easy task, has been made more difficult by the discovery in the Michigan tax registers of non-citizens bearing Roman names.24 The "Gnomon of the Idios Logos" regards this as a heinous offence.25 The main perpetrators of this crime were the children of Roman soldiers who had for some reason not reached citizen status. The wives of Roman veterans were also guilty since they were
assuming Roman names, though the privilege affecting them was *conubium* and not citizenship. There is little sign in the record of citizenship being granted to wives, as was suggested in the imperial decrees of Octavian and Domitian, still less to parents. Yet the vast majority of our evidence concerning veterans and their privileges comes from the second century when the scope of the citizenship privileges had narrowed. The mixing of names, so well demonstrated in the archive of C. Iulius Niger, makes it virtually impossible to accurately assess who had Roman citizenship and why.  

The famous letter home of Apion, saying that he had changed his name to a Latin one upon joining the fleet, may show common practice and so we cannot tell whether citizenship was granted to the son in his own right or on account of his father's status.  

The evidence has produced a number of Latin birth certificates which suggest that some care was taken to record the births in the family with a view to claiming citizenship privileges. The numbers of women bearing Roman names and the number of traceable families and other interconnections within the communities of the North-Eastern Fayum suggest that families did successfully claim and preserve their Roman citizenship through several generations though grants were renewed by military service in later generations.
I have yet to spot any clear evidence of a distinction operating between the children born during service and those born after service with the possible exception of the problematic will of M. Valerius Turbo.\textsuperscript{29} The distinction which came in for the auxiliary veterans in the 140's should have caused problems for those veterans who had children at both stages since the rights of the earlier ones were distinctly questionable with regard to inheritance and the like. To argue from silence would be unreasonable, given the nature of the evidence and the rather ambiguous hints in the sources. The privileges of the military will may well have provided a veteran family with a possible solution to the problems but it also seems possible that veterans and their families were able to ignore the problems. It seems that the changes in the wording of the diplomas did not make any significant difference to the veteran or his family.

Now let us turn to the question of liturgies and the exemption of soldiers and veterans from these burdens. The edict of Octavian granted to all veterans exemption from public tasks and seems to have extended this \textit{immunitas} to the parents, wife, and children of the veteran. This set of privileges was confirmed by Domitian, who also seems to have granted \textit{immunitas} to the soldiers retiring from the service. The grant was again extended to cover their parents, wives, and children.
The "Digest" contains much discussion about the nature of liturgies and the exemptions from them. There is a difference between those liturgies which require merely the time and the presence of the liturgist and those liturgies which require the expenditure of the liturgist's money. There is a third category which requires both. A veteran was not required to perform the munera but was required to perform the patrimonial liturgy. In other words, he was forced to perform those liturgies which were an expense, since these were regarded as a form of taxation, but not those which required personal labour. There were, however, certain exceptions to the rules. Ulpian certainly believed that veterans were exempted from most liturgies, although he did accept that veterans were due to pay the taxes and other usual obligations that went along with the estates they owned. This principle was interpreted by other jurists to mean that the veterans were liable for all liturgies which required expenditure, unless specifically exempted. Veterans were exempted from the duty of being a host to visiting officials and other dignitaries which, of course, would include soldiers. There was a certain amount of doubt at the edges as to which tasks a veteran was liable to perform but the principles seem reasonably well agreed. Interestingly, the only reference to the family of the soldier comes in an entry concerning the liability of serving soldiers to perform liturgies. The duties were not to be performed by a
serving soldiers under any circumstances but the family of the soldier were liable for liturgical service. The regulations did not prevent a veteran undertaking a liturgy out of the goodness of his heart. Some liturgies did carry a certain amount of prestige, such as the holding of a municipal office, or provide an opportunity for profit, such as tax collecting offices, and the goodwill generated by voluntarily accepting a burdensome liturgy was probably worth something to the veteran.

Our evidence from Egypt is best on the question of liturgies. The documents are well known and have been extensively quoted, if not extensively discussed. The first document is in such a poor condition as to make it almost unreadable. It seems to be a dispute between one Anthestius Gemellus and a Sabinus over a liturgy. Anthestius Gemellus may well have been a veteran. Sabinus became a soldier. The papyrus is dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius. Yet, it is impossible to draw firm conclusions due to the state of the document. The next to be considered is an appeal made by C. Iulius Apollinarius in A.D. 172 against enforced liturgy. This man was a veteran and had been pressed into continual service in a liturgical post. He claimed that the length of his service was in excess of that allowed for "natives" and so it was even more iniquitous that he was forced to perform it. As a veteran, he enjoyed
the legal right to five years in peace, before he could be called upon to perform liturgies. Also, he was too old for such a task as had been set. The many grounds stated by the veteran for his exemption do not suggest that the veteran was not confident that the military exemption was not powerful since it was common practice to appeal on as many grounds as possible and not just the most cogent. But it is clearly significant that the exemption allowed to veterans was only five years and that he had not been able to assert even this privilege previously. The five year rule does not appear in our other sources. The next document to consider was a collection of rulings on the exemption of Antinoopolites from liturgies in areas other than the city. The document is undated but seems to have been collected some time after 156. The collection was made in connection with the appeal of a veteran for exemption from liturgy who seems not to have used his status as veteran, as far as can be discerned, but based his case on his Antinoopolite citizenship.\(^{34}\) It seems that the privileges connected with citizenship of that city were more easily asserted than veteran privileges. There is a list of groups of people available to work on the dykes in A.D. 229/30 at Philadelphia. Amongst the categories of men available were the sons of veterans and cattle-keeping men.\(^{35}\) These documents form the normal corpus from which discussions start. However, I would add two other documents.
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M. Anthestius Gemellus was nominated to a liturgy in a neighbouring nome some time between 117 and 138, and he is attested as a serving soldier c. 90. From 179/80, there is a petition addressed to the prefect of Egypt from Dionysius Amyntianus, a discharged veteran of the ala Apriana, complaining that he had brought blankets from the Oxyrhynchite to Alexandria for delivery to the legion but was unable to find anyone to receive the blankets. He had waited for forty days but had run out of provisions and now wanted to go home. He did not complain that he had been illegally forced into the liturgy nor does he make much use of his veteran status.

The traditional view of the evidence is that it shows a gradual erosion of the privileges of the veterans. I think that this picture can be questioned. The Philadelphia papyrus is a strange document. The other group that clearly emerges from the papyrus are the cattle-keeping men who were also exempted from liturgies. This creates rather a problem; is this list, instead of a list of those due for service on the dykes, a list of those exempt? Veterans are not included on the list but if the sons of veterans had lost their immunity, they should not have been defined as a specific group in the list. The document must be a list of those immune. The other immune groups that do not appear on the list must be lost in the lacunae in the papyrus.
Therefore, in 229/230 soldiers' sons were still enjoying some immunity from liturgy. The other documents show the veterans either performing liturgies or trying to defend their immunities and are spread across the second century. It appears that the authorities regularly nominated veterans for such posts and that veterans were unable or, in some cases perhaps, unwilling to resist this pressure.

Veterans also enjoyed a privileged status when it came to the criminal law. They could not be condemned to the beasts or beaten with rods. Like decurions, neither they nor their children were to be condemned to the mines nor to work on public schemes since this was beneath their dignity.\textsuperscript{39} This is a sure sign that soldiers and veterans were of the higher status group: the honestiores. There is a papyrus which deals with the complaint from a veteran who had been beaten by the strategos who ignored his status as a veteran.\textsuperscript{40}

The legal status of soldiers, with regard to their civilian business and commitments position, was that of being away on state business. They enjoyed the rights of an in integrum restitutio, which meant that their property must be left untouched until they returned from service. Creditors were allowed to seize property but that property was to remain unsold. This privilege was to remain in force
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until a year after discharge and this was, in the later Empire, extended to include the property of the wife of the soldier. 41

Soldiers were not allowed to own land in the provinces in which they were serving. 42 This was modified slightly by the ruling that it was fine as long as they were not caught. If complaints were received whilst a soldier was in service, then the property was confiscated by the fisc but if the soldier avoided detection until his discharge, his property was to be left untouched. Also, a soldier was allowed to intervene, if the property had previously belonged to the family of the soldier but, because of difficulties paying taxes etc., the property had been put up for sale by the fisc. It seems that they were allowed to conserve their family estates but not to add to them. Soldiers could accumulate property but it had to be counted as their castrense peculium which was held separately from their ancestral holdings. Goods could be accumulated by bequest or by the everyday activities of the soldiers.

There are also in the edicts of the emperors certain privileges exempting the veterans from the customs duties levied by the Roman government. The soldiers were exempted by Octavian in 31 B.C. and these privileges were confirmed by Domitian. Nero also, in his general reform of taxation,
seems to have continued the exemption of soldiers from these duties.\textsuperscript{43} I have found no mention of these privileges in the Digest or the other law codes of later periods. Veterans enjoyed the privileges granted to all Roman citizens such as exemption from the poll tax.

The legal position of the Roman soldier was not distinguished by privilege alone. The soldier was not allowed to enter a legal marriage. This seems to run contrary to the general tendencies of Roman imperial legislation to force people into marriage to produce legitimate offspring and the wish to better the position of the soldiery so as to secure their loyalty. Even more so as the ban has been assumed to have been put in place by the Emperor most firmly associated with the marriage policy and the supervision of the morals, Augustus.\textsuperscript{44} This ban created a number of problems which later emperors sought to ameliorate. Claudius removed the anomaly that Roman soldiers were regarded as unmarried men even though they did not have the right to get married and produce legitimate children.\textsuperscript{45} At some indeterminate date, probably after this, soldiers were granted the right to institute "\textit{peregrini}" as heirs.\textsuperscript{46} This enabled the soldiers to make provision for their illegitimate children and their widows. Hadrian then modified the law to enable these illegitimate children to inherit property when the soldier died intestate.\textsuperscript{47} But the
ban on marriage itself was not lifted until the reign of Septimius Severus, if then. All these measures were designed to soften the effects of the ban on marriage.

The "Gnomon of the Idios Logos" and the dossier of marriage cases collected under Trajan or possibly Hadrian are quite clear that marriage was forbidden for the soldiery. The various problems that this caused are well known. The "Gnomon" deals with the conflict in status between the wife, who remained Egyptian and the family, who became Roman. The case of a daughter of an Egyptian mother who became Roman and was not allowed to inherit from the mother established a general problem. The property, therefore could not pass to her children. It is open to speculation how far such provisions were ignored.

Before analysing the historical importance of these privileges, we must consider the differences between the various branches of the Roman military and whether these had any significant impact. The legionary veterans do not, in most cases, seem to have been given diplomas. We know from the diplomas some of the rights given to the auxiliary and fleet veterans upon their discharge from the army and the navy but the evidence brought forward is not relevant to the legions. The decrees of Domitian and Octavian were not specific as to the type of unit they were referring to, so
it must be a logical conclusion to reach that they both referred to all soldiers serving under their command. The auxiliary irregulars were probably not to be included in the scope of Octavian's grant since the auxiliaries had not been organised on the regular basis of later periods but by the time of Domitian's decree, quoted by a legionary veteran, they were a recognised and regular part of the Roman military. The Digest makes no distinction between soldiers serving with the auxiliary units or with the legions. In one entry it does distinguish between the fleet and the rest since veterans of the fleet were not allowed to serve as decurions and the other veterans were. So two of our main sources do not distinguish between the different types of veterans but the third, the diplomas do, in that they are only granted to legionaries in extraordinary circumstances.

How then did the legionary veteran establish his rights to the privileges associated with discharge and was the veteran allowed that important retrospective right of conubium prior to the change c.142? In a recent article, J.C.Mann and M.M.Roxan have cast doubt on the traditional view of the diploma as a discharge certificate and as proof of status. They argue that the diploma had little real significance for the legal position of most of the discharged veterans and that the extant diplomas were merely
extra proofs of citizenship, bought by the veterans concerned. These veterans were drawn into buying the documents since normal procedures for proving citizenship, the direct evidence of commanding officers, still stationed nearby or the use of character references, were not available to them. This theory, they believe, is backed up by the evidence from Egypt, the epikrisis documents, showing veterans receiving privileges without producing the bronze diploma and using letters to prove status. The need to produce documentation was, they argue, peculiar to Egypt. This argument, however, does not seem to prove the point. The epikrisis documents, which are important for the establishing of legal status within civilian society, show clearly that inferior privileges were granted to those who could not produce the bronze diploma. Many of the diplomas were found in the environs of forts. This suggests that veterans did need the diplomas even when within easy reach of the fort. There is no convincing evidence that veterans had to pay for their diplomas. There is a letter, republished in the article, from the commander of an auxiliary unit stating that a soldier had been discharged from the unit. It is unwitnessed. This letter, they suggest, could be used to claim all the due privileges. It differs from the diploma in many ways. The argument does have a certain appeal as a way round the problem, since if the diploma was not a significant document for the veteran,
explaining why legionaries did not receive one becomes less of a problem than explaining why some auxiliaries did receive one. Yet the thesis seems to be untenable. The letter published cannot perform all the functions attributed to the auxiliary diploma and is probably best interpreted as a letter attesting discharge before the completion of the twenty-five year term of service. A soldier discharged early would have some need of such documentation, not least to prove that he was not a deserter, and would have the right to some privileges but would not be given the citizenship. The rights of citizenship are the main concern of the diplomas and the very fact that these documents are engraved upon bronze attest to the significance of this grant. The diplomas were copies of the grant of citizenship which was stored on the Capitol in Rome. Suetonius tells us that there had been, before the destruction of the Capitol in A.D.69, 3,000 bronze tablets stored on the Capitol, recording decrees and edicts, treaties and alliances, and privileges granted to individuals. Vespasian took a personal interest in the restoration of the archives destroyed and it was to this archive that the master copies of the citizenship diplomas were sent. The grant of citizenship to large numbers of discharged veterans was an important act and the use of bronze even in the copies of such documents is perhaps not too surprising. Legionaries were, in theory at least, already citizens and so there would be no need for
the bronze plaque. A document granting a legionary certain
privileges was not of the same order of importance. The
conclusion that we must reach is that legionaries were
presented with a different type of document, not made of
bronze, and so not preserved. It is feasible, indeed quite
likely, that such a document, which might not be needed very
often, would not be preserved in large numbers even amongst
the papyri but the dossier of documents containing the
decree of Domitian from Philadelphia also contains a
document resembling a discharge certificate.\textsuperscript{59} This solves
the problem.

The papyri do show certain divisions between the
different units. Possibly the most famous document is the
reconstituted account of an attempt to gain a hearing in
front of the Prefect. This took place in A.D. 63 at various
points around the camp at Nikopolis and the city of
Alexandria. The prefect, Tuscus, was being pursued by a
group of veterans. Initially, they had some limited success
but were not satisfied and after what seems to have been a
rowdy confrontation, the prefect spoke to them. He
instructed the veterans to return home since matters were in
hand. He had written to the \textit{strategoi} of the nomes to
instruct them to abide by the terms of the imperial
constitution. However, the veterans did not get all their
own way since Tuscus seems to have angrily rebuked them for
wasting time and to have informed them that not all their positions were the same: "I said to you before that the basis of complaint is not similar or the same for each of you. For some of you are legionary veterans and some from the cohorts, some from the alae, some from the oarsmen group so that the legal right is not the same for all". There was one rule for the legionaries, one for the cohorts and the alae and the rowers of the fleet. The use of a *men and de* clause suggests that the veterans were, in fact, split into two groups: legionaries and the rest.60

The *epikrisis* documents also distinguish between veterans from the various groups. Typically these documents list the veterans of the alae, cohorts, and the fleets but do not mention the veterans of the legion. It may be doubted whether this was due to any real difference in privilege, rather than a difference in procedure. More convincingly, there is a document from some veterans of the X Fretensis, serving in Judaea. These veterans had been transferred from the fleet at Misenum to serve with the legion, presumably at a time of crisis. These Egyptian recruits wished to be discharged not from the fleet but from the legion and wished documentation to be issued with that effect. The Prefect, reluctantly, acquiesced.61 Again, we have no idea what the particular motivation was for the veterans, but we can surely be confident that they would not have lesser
privileges being discharged from the legion than from the fleet. In theory, all legionaries were citizens before enlistment, but the reality seems to be of grants of citizenship upon entry to service. The "Gnomon" contains a clause denying privileges to Egyptians who had managed to sneak into the legions. The legionaries certainly had a higher status, yet recruitment patterns from the second century show that the citizen community of Egypt were recruited into the fleet, the auxilia, and the legions which suggests a gradual blurring of distinctions. This does not suggest anything concrete about the privileges due to the various groups since we cannot assume that the legal position of veterans was the governing factor behind volunteering. The veterans of the legion and the fleet in Caesarea were evidently in a difficult position. They were possibly non-citizens of Egyptian origin who had been drafted into the fleet. They were due citizenship rights and discharge privileges. However, citizenship was not granted to the legionaries upon discharge. It seems possible then that these men had to arrange their discharges with exceptional care so as to obtain their citizenship rights and their desire to be discharged from the legion need not have any implications for the legal position of the discharged men but be rather a matter of prestige.
The best evidence of legal difference is the Tuscus statement but the very fact that he gave the statement to an assembled group of veterans from the different services shows that they were similar enough in complaints and needs to make common cause. It is virtually impossible to distinguish between the legionary and his lower status colleagues when we come across them in the chora. The designation "veteran", used sporadically by the ex-soldiers, does not seem to carry any association with a particular unit. Legally, the division apparent in Tuscus's statement is not apparent in other evidence. An explanation for this may lie in the date of the document and the situation Tuscus was in. There is a papyrus from A.D. 139 which is a complaint from the strategos of the Koptite nome. This man complained about the higher status groups acting as tax collectors in the nome and not submitting accounts to him. This document is always quoted as an example of the general unruliness of the veteran population but if we look at the document from the perspective of the veteran, our interpretation changes. A more neutral response would be take the document as a move by the strategos in a continual conflict between the nome authorities and the privileges of the veteran and the other status groups. Tuscus was faced with a similar position. On the one hand the veterans were complaining of ill-treatment at the hands of the nome authorities, and on the other the nome authorities were complaining about the self-
important veterans who refused to do what they were told. His most pressing problem was the group of angry petitioners. The statement, intended to divide the veterans and calm the situation, may well have exaggerated the differences between the various veterans. We know a lot less about the position of the auxiliary veterans of the pre-Flavian period than the veterans of the later first and second centuries and it may well be that their rights were not as clearly defined in the earlier period. This means that there may have been genuine confusion about their status in the nomes and Tuscus may well have tried to resolve the conflicts of interest by attempting to diminish the status of the new citizens. The distinction between the various veterans did exist but it would be a mistake to over-emphasise this division. Also, it is mere conjecture to advance the division from 63 to all veterans at all periods ignoring the changes post 69. There is no really strong evidence of specific legal differences between veterans of the various arms of the military.

J.B. Campbell's assessment of the privileges stresses two main factors: "The exceptionally exacting nature of the professional soldier's career and the special problems created by long absence from home in the service of the State demanded a relaxation in some areas of the law. 
Obviously the need to keep the army relatively contented with its lot was of great importance to an efficient military establishment. This leads to the second explanation of the army's legal privileges. The soldiers comprised the largest group of people who were performing a vital service for the State and whose loyalty was essential to the emperor.  

He explains the testamentary privileges as originating "as a means by which emperors attempted to avoid discontent within the army, provide some protection from the rigours of military life, and perhaps assist recruitment."  

Later, on the castrense peculium: "It is plausible to suggest that the privilege of castrense peculium was necessary to keep the troops in good heart... Once again it seems that the soldier, who had none of the usual criteria for legal privilege, enjoyed a substantial advantage." Campbell goes on to suggest that the soldiers were virtually immune from the workings of the law. "Was the widespread oppression of civilians by soldiers a symptom of the general inability of emperors to control any of their servants... or did it least in part result from the difficulties of prosecuting soldiers in court and a deliberate reluctance by officials and governors, who took their guidance from the emperors, to proceed against the soldiers on behalf of the civilians, who were not as important to the welfare of the empire and its ruler?"  

This is a fairly consistent picture of the privileges due to
the soldiers and veterans; the soldiers were given privileges to stop them from revolting, backing other aspirants to the throne, or generally creating problems. The picture we have is of a gradually more and more powerful soldiery, enjoying greater and greater privileges culminating in the reforms of Septimius Severus. Herodian's view is decidedly negative. The account runs: "The soldiers too were given a substantial sum of money and with this many other privileges that they had not had before such as an increase in pay (which Severus was the first to give), permission to wear a gold ring and the right to live at home with their wives". This is the final move in the policy of elevating the soldiery. At this point, they enjoyed some of the same privileges as the equestrian order.

This is the standard picture of the position of the soldiery in modern accounts and does have a certain appeal. The Empire was moving from the pseudo-Republican Principate to the military dictatorship of the Dominate. A great deal of emphasis is placed upon the rise of the soldier, socially and legally, to a position where the terroristic activities of the soldier not only went on but were winked at by the authorities. I do not wish to discuss at length the behaviour of the soldiers, but the legal privileges of the soldiers that made such behaviour possible. It is clear that there was a certain level of violence in the relationship
between soldier and civilian which could result in complaints against the soldier. The soldier was in a particularly good position to deal with those complaints since he was to be judged in camp. A soldier was not to be summoned away from the standards. This meant that a soldier was likely to be judged amongst his own people and in a military court. This system was open to abuse and must have intimidated many a prospective litigant. This is not in question. What is more open to doubt is the tacit consent given to such activities by the imperial government. Administratively, the measures governing the trial of soldiers do not seem that unusual. It would have been more unusual if the case was heard amongst the friends of the prosecutor than the defence. Also, the government had an over-riding interest in limiting the external business of the soldiers so that they would be available in camp. The litigant who was not satisfied with the treatment meted out to him could always appeal to higher authorities. The standards of justice were probably not high but we should surely not expect them to be so. It seems unlikely that any modern body, in a similar position to the army in the state, as a policing power, administrative agency, and military force, would be able to maintain high levels of decency and honesty. How much less so would this be the case in ancient societies when patronage, corruption and a certain amount of social violence was the norm. Accepting this, it is a giant
step to say that the violence and corruption were approved of by the authorities or that the soldiery were out of all control.

There are certain other problems related to the picture of the privileged Roman soldier. Firstly, there is the attitude of the emperors. Vespasian, coming to power in dubious circumstances, needing to assure himself of the loyalty of the military, did not pay a donative upon his accession and may have been a little dilatory in granting what was due to the soldiery.\(^7\) There was certainly a reduction in privilege under Antoninus Pius when the auxiliary's children no longer received the citizenship at the same time as their father. The emperors who did grant privileges to the soldiery were Augustus, Claudius, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian and Septimius Severus. After the crisis of the third century and a series of very weak emperors the rights enjoyed by the soldiery were not in excess, or rather not greatly in excess, of the rights enjoyed at the beginning of the second century, although pay had been increased.\(^7\) It does not seem possible to argue that weak emperors indulged the soldiery and strong emperors took a firm line with them. However, it is quite easy to see that ancient historians, wishing to castigate bad emperors, would see the granting of excessive privileges to the soldiers a sign of weakness.
Another problem is the rule on marriage. This ruling remains unexplained. It obviously caused many problems for the Roman soldiers and veterans but was not revoked by any emperor up to the reign of Septimius Severus and even then the notice of the revocation of the ban remains ambiguous. Claudius removed an injustice in the laws penalising the unmarried soldier, but thought the ban worth continuing. Hadrian continued to emphasise that marriage was against the strict military practice. It does not seem to have occurred to him to revoke the ban on marriage or grant serving soldiers the right of conubium. Yet, as far as can be seen there was no serious attempt to prevent soldiers from taking "wives" as the diplomas and the Hadrianic edict show. The decrees of Domitian and Octavian also seem to assume that a veteran would have a wife and children, though it is difficult to see whether this is at the moment of discharge or at some point in the future. Campbell seeks to explain the law, having admitted that no emperor was in a position to impose it because of their reliance upon the troops, "In fact it may well have been Augustus who introduced the prohibition on marriage in service. He was evidently anxious to impose a stricter discipline after the chaos of the civil wars; perhaps when the emperor organised the length and conditions of service in 13 B.C., he imposed the rule of celibacy. It could be argued that in theory the army would
be a more disciplined and efficient force if it were not encumbered with wives and children."73

On any view of the ancient economy the land was by far the most important investment and the greatest source of political and social prestige. Soldiers were forbidden to hold land in the province in which they served. Although exceptions were made when a soldier needed to rescue his family lands. Again, this is a problem for the soldiery and there seems to have been no attempt to relieve it. The testamentary privileges of the soldiery seem in the law codes to have lasted for the year after discharge and then to have lapsed. If the main reason for these privileges was to assure the soldiers that the particular emperor had their welfare at heart, why was the privilege not automatically extended to veterans as well? We cannot assume that the soldiers were too short-sighted to see that one day they too would be veterans. Trajan's reason for granting the privilege was the extreme ignorance of the soldiery. This is not the most flattering reason for the grant of a privilege, and this factor presumably did not magically disappear upon discharge. A new approach is needed.

For this approach we need to re-analyse the privileges granted to the veterans into two separate categories: those privileges granted to alleviate the strains of prolonged
absence from home and to deal with the legal position of the soldier and those privileges designed to give status. Once we have separated out the privileges it will be possible to examine with greater clarity the position of the soldier and veteran within society.

The life of a Roman soldier had, like the life of most soldiers, an element of risk. This did create certain problems for the soldiers. This is an adequate explanation for the lack of formality in the making of the will and there is some evidence that this was used most extensively on campaign, when the soldier was not within easy reach of legal advice. Julius Caesar honoured the last wishes of the soldiers under his command and it is possible that other republican generals did likewise. It is a law of convenience and should not really be seen as a special privilege granted by an emperor.

If we look at the other privileges associated with the will, the right to make a peregrinus heir and the right of an illegitimate child to inherit without a will, we see an attempt to modify the situation caused by the illegality of marriage. It was also an attempt to come to terms with the stationing of the soldiers amongst the peregrini and with many of the soldiers having children of peregrine status. Even if soldiers had been allowed to marry, the conflict in
status between the soldier and the peregrine wife would have meant that the children still had the lower status since the soldier did not have the right of conubium. When these privileges of testament were granted, the pressure to take the next logical step and concede to the soldiers the right to marry and conubium must have been strong.

The soldier was a person absent on business of the state. He was removed from the civilian world for a period of twenty to twenty-five years. He was moved away from the normal society. What effect did this have and how did the Roman state deal with the matter? How do we interpret the limiting of the power of the father with regard to disinheriting his son and, more especially, the income the son had from his service as a soldier, thus tampering with one of the most powerful principles of Roman law? It is Augustus, the defender of the ancestral custom, who interferes with the testamentary rights of the father and it is Augustus who introduces the privilege of peculium castrense. What Augustus appears to be doing is removing the soldier temporarily from the potestas of his father. This can hardly have been merely a privilege granted in a moment of generosity. If there is a common thread between the various rulings it is the removal of these men from society. They could not own land. They could not marry. The property they hold in camp is separate from that of their
ancestral holdings. Augustus reinforced the geographical separation of the Italian troops from their families by separating them from the normal nexus of family loyalties and ties and did not allow them to build up such ties again in the provinces.

Immunity from liturgy provides good evidence for the effect of legal privilege. The authorities tried to ignore the extensive privileges due to the soldiers and veterans and there was a continual attack on the privileges of veterans. The importance of the rights as an Antinoopolite rather than as a veteran suggest that the veterans were not having their privileges respected. The high status of the veteran was replaced by the high status of the Antinoopolite. Military service could be represented as a form of liturgy, thus carrying with it a subsequent immunity. That veterans were having even this claim ignored, must be significant. The privilege, allowed by the "Gnomon", of writing the will in any fashion seems, in practice, to have been ignored by the veterans.

It is best to be careful about the relative dating of the various documents we have been discussing. All the documentation referring to how the veterans were treated after discharge in fact comes from the second century. The question of treatment in the first century must remain
unanswerable at present. I have suggested that the reason for the rather odd situation of the soldiery in the first century was the establishment of the standing army away from Rome and the desire of Augustus to separate out the military from the civilian. This is the final stage in the process of structural differentiation noticed by Keith Hopkins.  

Soldiers were separated out by Augustus and given high status privileges. This separation of the soldiery in the first century was immediately eroded by the soldiers themselves. As a standing army, they inevitably formed relationships with the local women, they had children, they settled down in the communities in which they had been stationed. By the second century the army had been thoroughly provincialised. An army which had been of foreign extraction and imposed upon the community was gradually assimilated to that community. This process created pressures and tensions since the legal position of solders would tend to separate them from the community to which they now belonged. It is conceivable that the privilege of citizenship allowed the veterans to maintain their separate legal identity but as citizenship declined in importance and other high status groups emerged such as Antinoopolites, the social prestige of being Roman must have become less useful. As the Roman military element of society was absorbed into the normal structure of Egyptian society, so the privileges granted lost their obvious justification. Legal privilege
Legal Status

could only be maintained by groups of high social status or political importance and the veterans, who were granted privileges which were not based upon any concrete distinction such as wealth or culture and had no common institutions to give them a political unity, had problems conserving their privileges.

The other side of the story is the law itself. The various developments in the law of Rome over the period which have been traced reasonably clearly show the lawyers trying to come to terms with the position of the veterans. In many ways this can be seen as an almost purely intellectual activity. The principles of the law and the position of the army were laid down by Augustus when the problem of how to deal with a standing army first arose. The later developments are piecemeal, showing a marked reluctance to break away from the established tenets of the law even when the social situation the law referred to no longer existed. The law is then divorced from social reality and only causes problems when someone actually applies it. A modern example would be the recent discovery that adultery is a criminal offence in several eastern American states but the Egyptian evidence gives us an equally good case. The ban on marriage meant that the children of soldiers were illegitimate and were therefore not eligible to join the Alexandrian ephebate in spite of the citizenship
qualifications of the parents. This ruling was received with frank incredulity by the father of the boys concerned. The law then becomes not a reflection of any social or political reality but an ideological statement by the government, in this case of Augustus, modified and altered sometimes for social reasons but sometimes for rhetorical purposes over time. The evidence presented here shows clearly the connections and the gap between the Egyptian reality and the imperial rhetoric.
Karanis: A small town in Egypt

The ruins of Karanis are today situated by the side of the main Fayum-Cairo road. As the road rises out of the fertile basin of the Fayum to enter the desert, the land changes dramatically from green to brown and at the very edge of the desert is Karanis; now beyond the edge of the Fayum but, from the southern edge of the site, it is barely a stone's throw to the fertile area. The modern road was paralleled in the Roman period by the road to Memphis which almost certainly passed close to the site, meaning that the town was connected as firmly to Memphis as it was to the rest of the Fayum. The ancient boundaries of cultivation stretched further out to the North and East, encompassing Karanis, but the preservation of such large numbers of papyri within the town shows the gradual retraction of the damp, fertile area. The town was dried out and remained desiccated in the intermediate period, preserving the papyri. Similar desiccation preserved papyri at the nearby towns of Soknopaiou Nesos and Philadelphia. Soknopaiou Nesos, the most Northerly of the towns and geographically separated from the rest of the Fayum by Lake Moeris, was the first to dry out. There are no significant papyrological finds from the site after the early third century. Karanis
and Philadelphia were to follow in the next centuries. Tied to each other by the water that they both depended upon, the history of these two villages seems to show many interconnections and I shall turn briefly to Philadelphia towards the end of this chapter. There are strong reasons for concentrating on Karanis. The village was saved from the depredations of the sebakhin, who removed the ancient rubbish from the village for use as fertilizer, by the University of Michigan. By this time the site was being exploited by an Italian fertilizer company who needed the archaeologists to provide them with enough sebakh to keep the railway which they had built into the site, running. The site, or the remains of the site, was dug extensively between 1928 and 1935 in an early example of rescue archaeology. These excavations produced a rich haul of papyri many of which have been published. More importantly, the vast amount of information from the papyri has been supplemented by the publication of the archaeological reports. Not only have the interim reports of the excavators been published but also more intensive studies have emerged on the coins, the pottery, the topography, and the lamps.¹

The documentation from first- and second-century Karanis is notable not only in the quantity and the quality of the information but in that the information concerns Romans and more especially Roman veterans.² This justifies a
closer study of the veteran community of the village and of the village itself. Only with this village do we have the detailed material to enable us to try and construct a picture of the life and community of Roman veterans. First, I will try to paint a picture of the village using the archaeological material then I shall go on to consider the archives of individual families.

According to the archaeological reports, the town spreads over a distance of approximately 1050m x 750m. The first traces at the South temple point to a first-century B.C. origin. In the South there was water and the town spread from this area during the late Ptolemaic period but the site remained small until the Roman period when the North temple was erected and the South rebuilt. The town started to spread. The golden age of expansion seems to have been from the mid-first until the early second century A.D.. By the end of this period, corresponding to the period C in the archaeological reports, the town had reached its full extent. Towards the end of the period there are signs of extensive disturbance. The rebuilding that had been going on in late C slowly ceases. There is a distinct recession c.160. The town had a new lease of life in the first half of the third century but in the second half it went into terminal decline. By the end of the century many of the town
houses had fallen down and by the fourth century even the
two great temples may have disappeared from view.4

The centre of the site has suffered the most from the
damage caused by the search for fertilizer and this is where
we would expect to find the public buildings of the town.
Even so it is significant that the only public buildings
known in the entire village are the two temples that now
dramatically stand out above the sand. The South temple was
the first to be built. The excavators recognised traces of a
mud brick building of no great size of the first century
B.C. on the site of the later Roman temple.5 The temple was
rebuilt in stone in the early Roman period. Excluding the
temenos wall the complex was 60m x 16m and the wall enclosed
an area of around 5340m². The plan and the arrangement of
the temple was Egyptian. The central pylon was probably 4.5m
high. It seems to have remained in use throughout the first
three centuries of Roman rule. There is evidence for the
repair and improvement of the temple under Vespasian and
later under Commodus suggesting that the site was
flourishing6 but the history of the temple mirrors that of
the site as a whole and by the late third century decay had
set in. Houses were being built within the temple complex7
and although this is probably connected with the rise of
Christianity, it may be seen as symptomatic of the gradual
collapse of the town and a sure sign that the grounds of the
temple were no longer regarded as sacred. The temple was dedicated to Pnepheros and Petesouchos, the local crocodile gods.

In contrast to the South temple, the North temple does not seem to have been divided from the rest of the town by a wall or at least none has been found. It was physically much smaller than the South being only 32.7m x 10.5m, about a third of the size of the larger complex. The pylon was 0.5m smaller than the south temple and it had nothing like the same intricacy of approach as the larger complex with its gateway, smaller pylon, and courtyard before reaching the main temple. The ground plan of the North temple struck the excavators as being typically Egyptian but the evidence for the god worshipped in the complex is nowhere near as clear as the South. An altar to Zeus Ammon Serapis Helios was found on the site together with some physical remains to suggest the importance of the crocodile and the report concludes "it is...quite possible that this temple was devoted to the cult of Souchos in the form Soknopaios combined with that of Zeus Ammon Serapis Helios and possibly that of Isis". The temple was erected at the same point as the South temple was rebuilt in stone, at the beginning of the first century, and continued in use until the mid- to late third century. Only one other religious building has
been found and the identification is dubious. House C178 may have been a Mithraeum.

The expansion of the town seems to have been unplanned. There was little regularity in the architecture or the topography. "Topographically, Karanis consisted of a series of insulae, or blocks, of houses along and between several main thoroughfares that ran from North to South... There were no through streets from east to west in Karanis. In order to traverse the town from east to west it was necessary to follow a zig-zag course along several interconnected short streets." The regular patterns of Ptolemaic or of Roman town planning do not emerge.

The period of the life of the town that interests me here is comparatively brief. I have to try and differentiate between the material cultures of the town in different periods since it seems relatively clear that Karanis had changed its nature in the later periods. However, the stratigraphy of the site and the quality of the original excavation leave something to be desired. The excavators were working in conditions that were far from ideal. The fertilizer company would have destroyed the site but for the intervention of the archaeologists. The excavators were also working with the methodologies of their time and used much untrained labour on the site. The previous depredations of
the sebakhin had already confused the stratigraphy and so the reports must be treated with a certain amount of care. C. Grande has pointed out that the lamps appear on stylistic grounds to vary very radically from the established excavation date. The coins from the site range in date from the third century B.C. to the seventh century A.D. and there are large numbers of coins from the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.. The first papyrological mention of a community at Karanis that I have so far discovered is an unpublished complaint from a basilikos georgos of the village of Karanis dated to 250-230 B.C. This all suggests that the excavators have opted for a far too narrow chronological framework and so care has to be taken to distinguish material that falls within our chronological framework.

The houses of the village all seem to have had a courtyard attached which was the centre of household life. There were stoves and bread ovens. Here domestic animals would be kept and fed. There is evidence of troughs and of pens. Many of the courtyards were unfloored. The courtyard was an extension of the house and, although it could be shared, was privately owned, as is attested by the frequent mention of them in the land leases and sales documents. Here the non-valuable goods of peasant life would be stored. The houses themselves seem to have been comparatively simple.
Very rarely are any details of the house included in official documents. Not all houses were the same yet they were sufficiently similar to prevent the necessity of any grading of them in household documents. Some had more than one storey, many had some means of access to the roof. In design, the houses appear to my eyes to be typically Egyptian. The plans and the pictures in the Michigan publications suggest that the houses were, on the whole, small, with few internal divisions. D.W. Hobson has estimated that the average house was around 75m² and was thus similar to the size of houses at Soknopaiou Nesos, Bakchias and for that matter to many modern peasant houses. I have not recognised any "hall structures", nor any private buildings that might have had a room for a gathering of clients. There is no sign of any villa like structures as known from the archaeology of the Western Empire. This is not to say that the buildings are all standardised or even that they all exhibit similar levels of material culture. There is variation in size and especially in decoration but the variation is not sufficient to invalidate the general pattern. There is little or no social differentiation within the architecture. It seems probable that the richer members of the village community would express their wealth by their exclusive control of living space. Hobson calculates that the average occupancy of the private house was probably
11.27 people which is consistent with the figures given in a 1979 survey of rural housing in Egypt.\textsuperscript{17}

The physical culture of the town remains difficult to determine. None of the art work or the archaeological finds suggest great wealth but it should be remembered that the town died a long drawn out death. Anything of value, that could have moved will have been moved. Study of the lamps discovered allows some safer generalisations. The most common lamps from the Roman period at Karanis, in Shier's typology B2.1, B2.2, B2.3, and B2.4, have interesting patterns of distribution. B2.3 was spread all over Egypt. B2.1 was connected with the North Fayum and the Delta. B2.2 mainly comes from around Alexandria. B2.4 are found in sites from the Delta and the Fayum. The earlier Roman types (B1.1 and B1.2) also show distinct connections with the Delta region of Egypt. The pattern points to the strong links between the Fayum and the Delta. There is no evidence of the lamps of Upper Egypt reaching Karanis.\textsuperscript{18} The pottery is overwhelmingly Egyptian in origin and much of it was locally manufactured. There is very little fine ware for the period of study, though there are a number of African red slip pots probably of third-century origin. There are also few amphorae, suggesting that there was little trade.\textsuperscript{19}
Economically, the town seems to have been almost entirely agricultural. There is no evidence of large scale industry or even of any specialist traders within the village. The texts from the site abound with references to olive production and two olive presses have been found on the site \(^{20}\) but the number of granaries discovered suggests that the main crop produced in the fields of the village was grain. \(^{21}\) The bone report show the presence of pig, mule or ass, antelope, cow, dog, crocodile, and horse. The pig seems to have been most common amongst the finds. It is unlikely that antelope was eaten in large numbers since the remains are small and it seems probable that hunting did not play a large part in the daily life or diet of the Karanis peasant. The horse, the animal of aristocrats, was the Asiatic horse and not the European animal. There is no mention of fish in the documentary evidence. Fundamentally the economy was agrarian and not pastoral and we might expect that the general diet of grain was occasionally supplemented by meat. \(^{22}\)

It remains to consider the approximate size of the population of the town. The evidence for this is not strictly archaeological but is of importance in our general assessment of the life of Karanis. The key texts for assessing the population must be the tax rolls of 171-4, P.Mich IV. A.E.R. Boak estimates the numbers of Egyptian
poll tax payers who appear in the tax rolls to be 575-644. Roman citizens are not included in this list but Boak estimates the Roman element in the population to be around 360. The poll tax payers are those Egyptians who were male and over 14 and so Boak, utilising data from the population censuses of the early twentieth-century, multiplies the figure to arrive at a total population for the town of 2160-2560. H. Geremek, using a higher co-efficient to estimate the total population of Karanis, opts for a figure for 171-4 of 2619 and also suggests a much higher figure for the population of 145-6 at around 4500 based on a summary of taxation from Karanis published as P. Ryl IV 594. Even allowing for under-representation in the source material as there would be a desire to avoid inclusion on the tax registers, we would come to a rough estimation of the population in 171-4 of under 3,000 and for the earlier period under 4,500, even using the highest credible estimates for population. It would seem that the Roman population of the village was about 14%. Karanis emerges from the archaeological reports to give us a reasonably clear and coherent picture of the town. The public space of the town was dominated by the two temples, both built to Egyptian models and both probably involved in the worship of the local crocodile divinity. Economically, the town was dependent upon the grain harvest,
though some olives were grown, and the diet was varied by some domesticated animal meat. The general economic level of the town seems to have been low with few luxury goods and the architecture does not suggest the presence of different social classes, though the differences may have been expressed in the internal organisation of houses rather than the architecture. There is no clear evidence of cultural differentiation within the community or of changes within the architectural patterns consonant with the arrival of a different social or cultural group. Culturally, the town seems to have been more closely associated with the Delta region than with Upper Egypt. The trading links seem to have been North although a lot of the material culture was common to the whole of the North Fayum. It was a small town or a large village. Nothing suggests that the town was exceptional or different from the nearby Fayum villages.
It is from this context that the veterans and their families emerge. Before looking at the general assessments of the position of the veterans in the community, the numbers of Romans and their impact in the community, I wish to consider some test cases. Several quite small archives have been found in the village detailing the activities of these families. The grounds for selecting these groups of documents are entirely practical. There is more accessible, clear information about these families than about others. The vast majority of persons known in Karanis are known from little more than a single reference. It is possible to attempt elaborate reconstructions of the family units in the town but these too often rest upon reconstructions that are uncertain and suppositions that are unsupportable. More importantly, the labour needed to construct and understand the elaborate relationships is greater than the value of the information obtained from these sources. Therefore, my aim is to minimise the prosopographic detail.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{C.Iulius Niger}

For ease of reference and to avoid a mass of footnotes, I intend to cite all the documents relevant to the archive in one note. Throughout the text the documents are differentiated primarily by date.\textsuperscript{27}
Before considering the economic situation of Niger, I shall reconstruct the family. *P. Mich.* VI 395 of 183 associates Niger with C. Apolinarius Niger who pays taxes on land belonging to Niger with Apolinarius's brother Longinus. The majority of the archive is made up of the documents of C. Gemellus Horigenes, who appears as Horion, also known as Gemellus, and Horion son of Apolinarius, and Gemellus Horion. He details his descent in a certificate of 214 in which he registered property of his father from his grandfather C. Iulius Niger. In a complaint to the prefect in 197, he describes property that had passed to him and his sister from C. Apolinarius, Antinoopolite. His uncle C. Iulius Longinus had died in 191 and his property had also passed to Horion. His sister and mother appear in a census declaration of 189. We can construct a family tree:

```
C. Iulius Niger
   /
  /  
Tasoucharion C. Apolinarius Niger C. Iulius Longinus
   /
  /
C. Gemellus Horigenes Gaia Apolinaria
```

The dates of birth and death of the family can be ascertained to a certain extent. From *P. Mich.* VI 428 of 154, it can be seen that Iulius Niger was born in 107. He was still alive in 186. His death must have occurred soon after
this for the property bought in 154 was registered as belonging to Gemellus Horion and Gaia Apolinaria in 189. Iulius Longinus was born in 155 and in P. Mich. VI 422 of 197 his death is dated to 189. The date of birth of Apolinarius Niger is unknown but he was still alive in 183. P. Mich. VI 422 of 197 states that he had been dead for some time which would suggest longer than the eight years of his brother. He was, therefore, not alive 189. In P. Mich. VI 423-4 of 197 Gemellus Horion states that he was born c. 171. The last document of the series comes from 214.

This well known archive traces the history of Niger and his family through three generations. The first appearance of Niger is in 154. Niger, described as a discharged cavalry man of ala veterana Gallica, being around 47 years of age, paid 800 dr. in full and in one instalment to Valeria Diodora who will appear again below under the Minucii, for a house in Karanis. The new house was followed in the next year by the birth of a son, [..]lius Longus. Niger appears as an Antinoopolite of the Osirantis tribe and the birth certificate of his son is witnessed by three other Antinoopolites. In 172-3, Niger petitioned the epistrategos Iulius Lucullus. He identified himself as an Antinoopolite and requested that he be exempted from the guardianship of the daughter of M. Anthestius Gemellus, Valeria Tertia. Niger had been assigned as guardian with
Valerius Komon but was able to escape his burden since as an Antinoopolite he was exempted from having to serve as guardian outside that city in spite of the fact that the girl was also an Antinoopolite.

Many of the documents of Iulius Niger concern land and the payment of taxes. We do not have a cumulative total for the amount of land involved in all the transactions but we can assess the amounts of land involved in all the individual transactions. None of the transactions seem to concern a parcel of land of any considerable size. Gemellus Horion states that he inherited in three parcels land totalling 3½ arouras around Psenarsenesis, which he registered with the village scribe of Karanis in 214. The registers of taxes paid for Niger by his sons in the 180s all involve very small amounts of produce. The most complete register, P.Mich. VI 385, suggests that the maximum amount of land in the possession of the family was around 3 arouras. Taxes on different types of land, on katoikic land in 183, still do not suggest large land holdings and some of the receipts are for less than one artaba of grain. The housing property owned by Horion and his sister seems to have been quite extensive. The census declaration of 189 lists the property of Tasoucharion and her two children. We may probably make the assumption that this represented the wealth of the entire family since by this time the two sons...
of Niger and Niger himself had probably died. The property includes a house and a courtyard, and 1/3 share in a house, a house and two courtyards formerly owned by Valeria Diodora, 1/3 share of two houses and two courtyards, 1/3 share of house and courtyard and another courtyard, a house and courtyard formerly belonging to C. Longinus Apolinarius, two courtyards, a courtyard and a house formerly belonging to Ptolemaios, and 1/3 share of a house and courtyard. Assuming that the property of their mother would pass eventually to the children, the children had the potential to possess in different arrangements in different areas of the administrative district 5 2/3 houses and 9 2/3 courtyards.

I will now try to consider the issue of social status separately from economic and legal status. Iulius Niger's involvement with the family of M. Anthestius Gemellus is probably better discussed in relation to that family. His successful avoidance of the burdens of guardianship in 172/3 should not blind us to the fact that he was appointed guardian in the first place. As an Antinoopolite, like Anthestius Gemellus, he was legally of the correct status to take on the task and this may have influenced Anthestius's choice when looking for a guardian for his daughter. He pays taxes for Tabous daughter of Pakysis at Bakchias in 186. He may have been acting as a guardian in this case or he may
have been acting for a friend or a lessee. We have several petitions of Gemellus Horion. It appears that he entered into dispute with Sotas and Iulius sons of Eudas over ownership of land. Gemellus was, by 197, losing his sight and the two brothers took advantage of this to try and steal the land claimed by Gemellus. He wrote to the strategos, to the prefect, and to the epistrategos about the incident. In 198, he was again writing to the epistrategos demanding his intervention in a case of intimidation and assault by the tax collector Kastor. Horion was told to refer his case to the local centurion. In 199/200 he again wrote to the epistrategos about the imposition of a liturgy from which he was exempted because of his blindness and his Antinoopolite citizenship.

The legal status of most of the family is not in doubt. As a veteran of a Roman auxiliary unit Iulius Niger would have been granted citizenship on discharge. This was probably not long before the house was bought from Valeria Diodora. His sons would have had the Roman citizenship and as Niger had Antinoopolite citizenship, they would have taken that as well. The wife of Niger remains a mystery. The wife of Apolinarius Niger is however known. Tasoucharion, without father, mother Serapia, Antinoopolite, brought with her a house and courtyard and a third of another house. Her dowry is significant enough, though it is impossible to
place an absolute value on the property. Her children were thus assured of Antinoopolite citizenship. This status is claimed most consistently and most vociferously by Gemellus Horion. Only once does he claim Roman citizenship and that is on the one occasion he appears in the documentation with the full three Roman names. In 214, he was C. Gemellus Horigenes, Roman and Antinoopolite. The various names under which he had sent off his petitions are perhaps significant. Gemellus Horion is of a confused status. His name was not secure and nor was his legal status, names being indicative of status. He should not have been a citizen unless his mother and father had both been citizens or his father had had conubium with his mother. Very clearly this was not the case. It is tempting to associate his adoption of the full Roman name with the *Constitutio Antoniniana* but this is surely the wrong approach since the importance of being a Roman had then disappeared and he had not adopted the gentilicium "Aurelius". Gemellus was trying to inflate his importance and does this by claiming Roman citizenship by association with his grandfather. It is to be noted that this is in a note to the village scribe and not to a Roman official.

The Niger archive illuminates the history of the family over around fifty years. Origins cannot be assessed. The family were comparatively well off but could not be
called wealthy. Their land was in small parcels and does not seem to have amounted to a great deal. They did accumulate fairly large amounts of property but it is difficult to place any valuation upon the houses especially as the period coincides with the slump identified at Karanis in the papyrological and archaeological record. The sons of Niger both had Roman citizenship but neither joined the army. The next generation lost the Roman citizenship but preserved Antinoopolite citizenship. Although Gemellus Horigenes complained about the behaviour of the villagers, he may have been able to gain access to the state powers. At least the officials replied. The final petition of the series is from 211/2 and in this he, together with Gellius Serenus, headed a petition claiming to come from all the farmers of Kerkesoucha about the water available for irrigation. His seemingly high status within the community in the later documents belies the weak and defenceless image that he propagated as a petitioner. The social relationships of the family, as far as can be seen from the documentation, do not seem to have been limited to one cultural group.
The Karanis Minucii are a relatively small group whose archive, if it can be called that, is associated with the same house as the C. Iulius Niger archive. The most interesting document and the earliest chronologically is a Domitianic division of property. C. Minucius Aquila with his full sister Minucia Gemella, under the guardianship of C. Sempronius Priscus (legionary veteran), and Minucia Thermutharion, under the guardianship of L. Vibius Crispus (legionary veteran), agreed to divide the property of their parents. Aquila received 6 arouras at Kerkesoucha, 1 aroura of newly planted olive grove, a house at Karanis, a granary and a dovecot. The daughters received in common 2½ arouras of katoikic land at Karanis, 1 1/8 arouras of land imposed by the village at Karanis, 3 arouras of katoikic land at Kerkesoucha, and 1 ½ houses at Karanis. In 154, the house and two courtyards bought by Iulius Niger were in the possession of Valeria Diodora because they had been bequeathed to her by her mother, Minucia Thermutharion. In this transaction, Valeria Diodora was supported by her husband and guardian Limnaios son of Pentheus son of Atreus. In 139, Valeria
Diodora sold another piece of her inheritance but does not tell us the previous owner. This property was sold for 408 dr.

The information given in these three documents is just enough to allow us to trace the changes in ownership of the Minucius estate. The property passed to the Minucii children from both father and mother. Father brought the majority of the property: 6 arouras at Kerkesoucha, the olive grove, the 2½ arouras of katoikic land at Karanis, the village imposition, which was exactly half the katoikic holding, the two houses, dovecot and granary at Karanis. The mother's estate provided only the 3 arouras at Kerkesoucha and half a house at Karanis. In village terms, the estate was quite large being 12 3/8 arouras of grain land and 1 aroura of olives. The majority of this property passed into the hands of the son but the property that remained in the hands of the daughters individually was in excess of the property owned by their mother, if only slightly. The geographical details given in this splitting of the estate concerning the houses and dovecot suggest very strongly that this unit was in Valeria Diodora's hands when she sold a house to Iulius Niger. The neighbouring property in the deed of sale also belonged to Valeria Diodora and consisted of a house and a dovecot. The property however had been divided between Aquila and his sisters. The only conclusion that can be
reached is that the property had once more been concentrated either in the hands of Valeria Diodora or her mother Minucia Thermutharion. The other two Minucii children failed to produce heirs.

A reconstruction of the family history is now possible. It seems clear that the father of the Minucii children was a veteran. Not only are both the the guardians of his children legionary veterans but the name of his son, Aquila, strongly suggests a military context. Ninucius was a man of some property and wealth and left his son a substantial estate and his daughters decent dowries. Of these children only Minucia Thermutharion had produced a child that survived to adulthood. She had married Valerius Heraclianus and their child, Valeria Diodora, had been born about A.D. 94. Valeria Diodora married Limnaios son of Pentheus son of Atreus and the property concentrated upon her which made Valeria Diodora and her husband comparatively well off. The legal status of the family seems relatively secure. The Minucii children were all Roman citizens and Minucia Thermutharion married someone with a Roman name. It seems likely that he was a Roman citizen. Their daughter carried a Roman name but married a Greek. The children of this marriage, of which there is no evidence, would have been Egyptian.
In contrast to the clearly defined links between the members of the previous two families, reconstructing the Anthestii is far more problematic and more representative of the type of material available from Karanis. The key figure in the account is M. Anthestius Gemellus who first appears in the sources in 90 at Karanis and disappears from view in the late 170s. Clearly, we must envisage the Anthestii Gemelli spreading across two or three generations. There is no proof that the Anthestii Gemelli were related but I would argue that there is a reasonable possibility of there being a relationship between them. "Anthestius" was not a common name. It was not rare in Roman Egypt but it is nothing like as common as the imperial gentilicia or as names like "Valerius" or "Sempronius". Karanis, with a relatively small population and the Roman element of that population being a minority, produces a disproportionate number of Anthestii and to have these Marci Anthestii Gemelli spread across eighty or ninety years would be an extraordinary fluke if they were not related.

The finds from the Arsinoite also demonstrate a number of Anthestii associated with the village of Philadelphia. Anthestius Numisianus and Anthestius Germanus are clearly associated with that village and some of the unplaced
references might come from there. Anthestii Capitolinus, Gemellus, and Tertianus are clearly associated with Karanis although the application to lease the right to sell oil from the works at Herakleia in the Themistes district of the Arsinoite in 162-3 show that Capitolinus had interests that stretched across the Arsinoite. Capitolinus cannot be tied in to the the Gemellus group but Tertianus can, if only by implication. In 172 Gemellus left as co-guardians to Valeria Tertia, his daughter, Valerius Komon and Iulius Niger with the child's mother Valeria Sempronilla having some ill-defined role. In the same year a tax receipt states that Apolinarius Niger and Valerius [Ko]mon paid taxes on behalf of Tertianus. Apolinarius Niger was the son of Iulius Niger. The precise relationship between Tertianus, Gemellus, the Valerii and the family of Niger is impossible to outline but there was evidently some relationship. With this in mind, I feel partly justified at least in treating the entire group as one unit.

The first appearance of Gemellus is in A.D. 90 when he represented his mother in a rescheduling of a loan to an Egyptian woman. Gemellus was at the time serving with the III Ituraeorum and was 35 years old. Unfortunately, the name of his mother with its clue to her legal status has disappeared into a lacuna. The rest of the family seem to have possessed Roman citizenship, as far as can be judged by
their names but they are only identifiable by those Roman names and so the case cannot be pushed too far. The younger Gemellus was an Antinoopolite as can be seen from his dealings of 166-9 and 172. In 166-9 he wrote to the epistrateiros Luceius Ofellianus requesting permission to stay in the village of Karanis to pay taxes and arrange his other affairs. Evidently his presence was demanded elsewhere.

The family seems to have been wealthy. They leased out land to other villagers. In 122, Gemellus rented out property at Bakchias amounting to 5 arouras of grain land. The tax payment of Tertianus in 172 seems to have been in connection with land of between 8 and 9 arouras. Capitolinus was not only able to bid for the oil retail trade in a different area, although the price for the licence was not too high, but was also the owner of an olive grove. Gemellus's mother was the lender of a loan of 440 dr on the security of 1½ arouras of olive plantation. The Philadelphia group also inform us of their economic status. In a Latin marriage contract of the second century, Numisianus gave his daughter a dowry of 2½ arouras around Philadelphia. A document which must be related to a property division at Philadelphia in 141 has Numisianus giving up all claims to land owned by Anthestia Cronous a portion of which was 5 arouras of katoikic land from around Hephaistos which was
near Philadelphia. Germanus, in either 150 or 173, rented out his 7 aroura olive yard at Philadelphia for 1,700 dr.

Germanus, an ex-gymnasiarch of Antinoopolis, was clearly a person of some wealth and social standing. Such a position might well have lifted him above the social and economic level of the village. His connection with the Anthestii of Philadelphia and Karanis remains however conjecture and too much weight should not be placed upon his social and economic position. Nevertheless, the economic position that the Anthestii seem to have reached in both these villages would suggest that they were towards the upper reaches of village society. The holdings are on a small scale but are larger that the average village holdings.

Socially and legally, the status of the Anthestii is difficult to determine. Their dealings seem to have been largely with people with Roman names, they have Antinoopolite citizenship. They were lenders and not borrowers. We must conclude that the Anthestii were, as a group, of relatively high social status within the village.
I wish to look briefly at two other archives. These archives are different from the others in that both contain a number of Latin documents and both are comprised mainly of letters. This means that the personalities emerge more vividly from the material but that the information is sometimes not of any great value.

C. Iulius Sabinus was a soldier of III Cyrenaica in 96. The letter, P. Mich. VIII 485, addressed him as signifer. C. Iulius Apollinarius was a soldier of the same legion in 107. His two letters of that year celebrate his promotion through the direct influence of the commander of the forces, Claudius Severus. Apollinarius was based in the new province of Arabia. By 119, Apollinarius's rise had brought him to the position of frumentarius of Rome whilst still being attached to the same legion.32
The archive is full of letters and like all personal communications alludes to various people in common and relies upon the common knowledge of the reader and writer. That common knowledge means that there are a large number of people referred to who do not appear elsewhere and whose roles remain mysterious. But we are able to make some attempt to reconstruct the family and social circle of these two men. The "grandmother" of Apollinarius was Sambathion, mentioned in P.Mich. VIII 465 and whose will was dated to 117-8. Sambathion was the daughter of Nilos son of Nilos from the metropolis and wrote her will with the help of Sokrates son of Sarapion. The will is not completely preserved and so it is difficult to see exactly what was left to whom but Sambathion did leave the slave Abaskantos to Iulius Sabinus, the son of her brother Nilos, who served with the legion and also left something to Iulius Apollinarius, son of Sabinus. P.Mich. VIII 465 also mentions Apollinarius's sister, Iulia Serapia, who appears in an unpublished census declaration in which Sokrates son of Sarapion acted for both Serapia and Apollinarius. The rest of the archive is littered with names. Many of these names are Roman and this may in part be explained by the military context of many of these letters. The letters home tell a slightly different story. Greetings are sent to Ptolemaios, Ammonios, Thermouthis, and Aphrodisia.
There is comparatively little information about the financial state of the family. In 119, Sabinus son of Sokrates rented 2 arouras around Bakchias, \( \frac{3}{4} \) of an aroura around Karanis, 2 arouras of olives around Onkos, near Alkias another aroura of olives, and around Hiera another 2 arouras of olives. The reappearance of the names Sabinus and Sokrates in the document might suggest that this was not an altogether purely economic transaction. Apollinarius was still serving in the legion at this point and had reached the office of \textit{frumentarius}. It is possible that this document represents the renting out of the entire estate of Apollinarius as he was unable to farm it or give it due attention. The dispersal of the units and the number might suggest this. Still, the olive groves do seem to be quite large and suggest some wealth.

These archives belonged to junior officers of the legion in the late first and early second centuries. We would expect them to show some signs of this higher status within the army in their civilian life. Undoubtedly they had Graeco-Egyptian origins, though were of the privileged metropolite group within Egyptian society. Although many of the names of the archive show distinct Roman elements, there is still a strong Graeco-Egyptian influence. \textsuperscript{33} Apollinarius was able to use his connections to rise within the ranks of the Roman legion and we later see him using that influence...
for others. It is not surprising to discover that they were a family of some means within village society.

Claudius Terentianus/Claudius Tiberianus

This set of documents is in many ways similar to the last group in that it involves junior officers of the legion. It does present some serious difficulties mainly around the relationship between Tiberianus and Terentianus. Terentianus always referred to Tiberianus as his father yet Tiberianus was always removed from the centre of family life and was only told about matters after some period of time. P. Mich. VIII 471, an account of a quarrel, includes the news that Terentianus's mother was with child, then, later in the story, she gave birth which enabled her to accompany Terentianus to Alexandria. The man at the centre of the story was Ptolemaios, the father of Terentianus. The relationship between the two Romans would be dismissed as one between an older and younger man who addressed each other with familial nomenclature, if the actual nomenclature of the two was not suggestive of a blood tie or Terentianus had not requested permission to buy a concubine slave. Terentianus seems not to have had any problems with the matter and I think that the solution to the question of the paternity of Terentianus is neither important nor within our ability to reach. Terentianus's relationship to both men was
as a son to a father. One father had an Egyptian name and the other had a Roman name and this places both Tiberianus and Terentianus firmly within the Graeco-Egyptian setting.

Terentianus commenced his career in the fleet since he could not get a posting to the land forces. He makes it quite clear that this was a second best option only preferable to a life of wandering. Allowing for exaggeration, it seems clear that Terentianus was unhappy in the fleet but was later able to accomplish his transfer into the legions. Tiberianus was, in an otherwise uninteresting letter, referred to as a speculator. P.Mich. VIII 472 shows that he was a relatively senior figure acting in cooperation with a frumentarius. There is no information about the economic situation of the family though it may be presumed from the tone and content of the letters that they were not amongst the poorer groups within Egyptian society.

The main results of this analysis are that these two soldiers who wrote to each other in Latin and were junior officers, were closely associated with Graeco-Egyptians. It seems more than likely that their own origins were not Italian but Egyptian.
It is now necessary to take the material outlined in the previous pages and try to move from the specific to the general. But first I must make some comments about the nature of the material so far exploited. The documentation that survives from Roman Egypt is overwhelmingly of a formal nature. Meaning that what are preserved are receipts for taxes, declarations to governmental officials and the material produced by major economic transactions, such as land sale or rental. Fully private documents, in a narrow sense of the word, are comparatively rare and the preservation of a reasonable number of these documents within our archives is exceptional. Preservation of the material is obviously dependent upon production. Therefore, archives will only be left by those who had cause to produce large amounts of papyrus and, as most of the documentation involves economic or official business, must be biased towards those who engage in a lot of economic or official business. Archives will then tend to represent the officially active and this must bias them to the economically and socially elevated. This is an oversimplification of the processes at work in the production and preservation of this material but it is impossible to accurately or meaningfully disentangle these processes which introduce a random factor within the preserved documentation. The preservation of documentation is not neatly related to the production of the material nor is
there necessarily a neat correlation between the production of material and the social and economic status of individual villagers and their families. But, in spite of this, there must be a tendency for the documentation to reflect more the lives of the wealthy and the socially influential than the poor and the socially powerless.

However, a certain pattern may be seen to emerge from the archives. The veterans discussed all seem to come from either the late first or second centuries. The origins of the families, as far as can be determined, cannot be pushed back beyond the mid-first century. This may be due to the general paucity of papyrological sources for the period prior to that but the increase in source material also coincides with the general increase in the size of the village suggesting an influx of people from outside. It is difficult to see the rise in population in the village across this period as being merely the result of internal fertility and not immigration to the village. Against this, the families who appear in this early period seem to have had Egyptian origins. There is no sign of any Italian origin for any of the families within the documentation or any origin external to Egypt though we would be very lucky to gain any such information. Only a very few of the documents in the archives were in Latin and these tend to come from more strictly military contexts. Greek seems to have been
the first language of the majority of our veterans, though the scattering of Latin documents is instructive. The cultural impact of these veterans within Karanis is indistinguishable and the land holding patterns and the economic activities of the veterans seems to have been fully integrated within the dominant cultural milieu.

Economic status is a matter of some historical concern. The veterans and their families within the archives seem to have been quite wealthy. This may be partly through the accident of preservation and also there is the problem of the familial structure of the generations studied. The families seem to have shown a tendency to concentrate their wealth through their decline in numbers so that Valeria Diodora came to be very wealthy whilst the estate left to her by the wills of her parents was not extensive. Concentration of the family wealth in the hands of one of the children does not aid our perceptions of the relative wealth of the family. In a more dispersed archive like that of the Anthestii, the evidence for real wealth comes only from Philadelphia and not from Karanis. However, all the evidence must be firmly set within the context of village society. The various families only appear wealthy within this relatively poor context. In general, the estates were small.
It is difficult to work out the economic profile of any group within Egyptian society and the Roman veterans are no exception to this. Geremek has collated the evidence relating to the village and more especially to the larger land owners. The picture that emerges from her analysis is far from clear. Both Roman and Egyptian appear in every economic group from the richest of the village to the poorest. However, there is a statistical weighting to be taken into consideration. The Romans at only 14%-17% of the population appear disproportionately amongst the upper levels. What this does show is that the Romans did not form a distinct economic "class". Nor are the criteria for the differentiation of economic groups meaningful. The level of the richest of the village was still low and the Geremek categories need not be socially meaningful. It is also clear that high economic status was not attained as a result of being Roman. Other factors ought to be considered. Roman veterans were those who had survived to a certain age. Given the very high death rates, they were men who had, in general, outlived their contemporaries. The importance for this in terms of economic status is that not only would family estates have been concentrated by the time of the veterans' release but also, in theory, he should have collected enough wealth to assure the status of his children. In the Minucii property division we saw that the daughters received just a little more property than their
mother had had. Partible inheritance meant that if a family were to preserve their economic status that status must improve during the working lifetime of the father or when the estate was divided the children would be in reduced circumstances. The concentration of estates from other family members or just profit from the exploitation of their own estates would lead to this gradual increase in wealth. Roman names suggest an immediate veteran ancestor and we might expect that if the wealth had followed normal patterning within a comparatively stable society that the veteran would not have been poor. This is of course all hypothetical and other such hypothetical possibilities open themselves up. Veterans, because of the peculiarities of their profession, may, in general, have married later or had fewer children, all of which would lead to their children having a little more money than their contemporaries. These suggestions help explain the fact that the Romans were disproportionately wealthy.

The legal status of the families does offer some interesting patterns. The children do seem to have adopted the Roman name and probably had Roman citizenship. Although there was a sufficiently large Roman community to allow the children to marry other Roman citizens and thus to preserve their citizenship through another generation, this pattern
Karanis does not seem to have been adopted. Other factors than Roman citizenship status governed marriages.

It is not surprising, therefore, when we see that socially, the Romans seem to have mixed with both Egyptians and other Romans. A lot of the documents are technical and legal and these would need people of similar status to fulfil the legal obligations. There is, therefore, a preponderance of Roman names or people of Antinoopolite status within the archives. The connections with Egyptians were, however, sufficiently frequent to warn against any attempt to limit the Romans' social interaction to other Romans. My impression is that, given the minority status of the Romans within the community, there is a slight preponderance of Romans within the archives but this may be due to the military context of some of the material. In terms of status within the community, there is insufficient evidence to be very positive but we can say that there are some signs of the Romans being influential but little sign that their status was regularised by the operation of patron-client relationships within the village. The high status of the Romans is expressed more subtly in the community through the ability of many of these people to gain access to people of authority.36
Karanis presents us with a picture of a "veteran community" in the sense that large numbers of veterans settled there. In a way though it is perverse to call Karanis such. The town appears archaeologically typical of the villages of the Fayum. There is little sign of any cultural change that could be called Romanisation. The veterans do not seem to have had any cultural impact on the town and seem to have adopted Egyptian customs and have thoroughly integrated to Egyptian society. The veterans that appear in our archives are clearly culturally Graeco-Egyptian and although there is some suggestion that the earliest veterans may have had external cultural roots, this does not seem to have been a major cultural factor. This leads more or less inevitably to the conclusion that many of the veterans who were active in Karanis in the second century were natives of that town or were natives of Egypt at the very least. I think it may safely be assumed that service in the armed forces was not economically or socially disadvantageous and Roman citizenship brought benefits with it. There does not seem to have been a shortage of recruits for the army in the second century and indeed our evidence has shown us that one quite well connected potential recruit could not enter the legion. It seems that the wealthier and more privileged in Egyptian society might have tended to join the army and this could explain the comparative wealth of many of the veterans on discharge. Yet not all the
wealthier served nor was service confined to the wealthier element. The Roman name, and therefore presumably military service, was spread through all layers of village life. The Romans did not correspond to a social class. The preponderance of Roman names in the archive documentation is further explained by the similarities of economic status between the Roman group, but the group was only part of a wider group that formed the wealthier part of the village. They were not a class either for they do not seem to have been differentiated clearly from their poorer neighbours. Roman status was a legal status. It is not reflected in the economic position or in any cultural or social distinction. As that status was desirable, if not essential for a successful villager, the status tended to be associated with the upper strata of village life.

It remains to draw some comparison with Philadelphia. J.F.Oates has studied the evidence for the Roman military element in Philadelphia. "The earliest occurrence of a Roman citizen is in the year 86..., one Marcus Antonius Aper. Before this date there is a great deal of documentation including the tax lists in the Princeton collection but no Romans". Philadelphia seems to have had a veteran population of around 20%. Oates has also analysed a tax register from 216 from the same village listing the land holders of the
village. Oates was able to calculate from this the average land holdings of the majority of the villagers. He was also able to identify a group of soldiers and veterans. The average veteran grain land holding was nearly 13 arouras whilst soldiers had 9½ arouras. For orchard land the veterans had less than one aroura but the soldiers had 4. This seems to have been virtually the same as the averages for the other land holders of the village. The veterans are once more firmly placed amongst the land holders of the village, with a reasonable land holding but by no means any great wealth. The archaeological information from Philadelphia is nowhere near as rich and the documentation is not on the same scale but the conclusions that are suggested about the veteran presence are similar.

These Fayum towns with their extensive finds of papyrus illuminate the social position of the Roman veteran. Quite clearly their presence in the Fayum was not due to some governmental initiative. They were on the whole natives to the area. Their culture was Egyptian or Graeco-Egyptian. It was the culture of the surrounding area. There are cultural connections to the North and Lower Egypt rather than with Upper Egypt but that is an accident of geography not an unusual cultural phenomenon. Our Roman veteran is not the representative of the imperial culture bringing new ways to the village. Roman to the inhabitant of Karanis was a
legal distinction with no clear economic or cultural meaning.
The idea of structural differentiation of specialist groups has crystallised much of the thinking behind Roman military history since what is differentiated can be studied separately from society. It forms its own field of study and so historians are justified in applying modern analogies, drawn from other structurally differentiated, professional armies, and concentrating upon the internal structure of the profession. The army is to be understood best from its own documentation. Thus Fink excludes from his excellent compilation of material any evidence that might relate to the relationship of the army to the civilian population. I do not question this method for limiting the evidence on practical grounds but it does distort any general view of what the army was doing in Egypt.

The first part of my thesis considers the function of the army. Egypt had a large garrison in the first and second centuries. After the initial conquest the size of the garrison gradually declined as troops were moved to more important arenas but Egypt was never completely demilitarised in the way other provinces were. Yet the threats the province faced or itself provided can hardly
have justified a garrison of this size. The evidence points to the fact that Alexandria was an immensely important city for the Romans. Augustus, for obvious reasons, Germanicus, Nero, Vespasian and Titus showed a special interest in the city and, as Vespasian's legions marched on Rome, Alexandria seems to have emerged as an alternative capital, the second city of the Mediterranean. The relationship of Caracalla to the city was complex and we should not underestimate the immense ideological hold of Alexandria, the city of Alexander the Great on the Roman elite. Under Cleopatra, the city had provided a unity for the Eastern Mediterranean, in the propaganda at least, and had threatened Roman dominance. But also, for more straightforward reasons, the city was militarily important. Alexandria was an important centre for the troops to gather in preparation for major campaigns. The city was on important sea lanes as well as providing a ready source of grain. Clearly the forces stationed in Egypt formed part of what may loosely be called the Army of the East and were an important element in Roman strategic planning.

Yet this is but one part of the equation: the picture as seen from above. The bulk of the evidence considered here shows a different picture. The army of Egypt was not concentrated to meet major threats. It was not continually training for the great campaigns. The army was dispersed
Conclusion

across the chora. The history of the army in Egypt is illuminated by individual incidents, by the episodic violence and rebellion which is mentioned by the literary sources and by the small town problems that dominate the papyrological sources. Egyptian society appears as a violent place. Study of Alexandria shows a city with a long history of inter-communal hostility with a potential for violence which was, most of the time, controlled. But, on occasion, the hostility was sparked into a conflagration. It was only when the situation was out of control that the army intervened. In the chora, the authorities seem to have tolerated a certain level of violence. The army only threatened to intervene when the situation escalated. The revolt of the Boukoloi demonstrated clearly how a particular situation which appeared tolerable could rapidly escalate in the face of social and economic problems on a large scale. The centurions were key figures in the control of this violence. In the nomes of Egypt, they investigated violence and banditry and any problems that might lead to social unrest. They were in a mediating position between the peasants and the government. The gunboats of the pax romana, they were symbols of the military power of the government and when things went wrong either the centurion would be respected or military power would be used to the kind of devastating effect we saw in the Mendesian nome. There is a tendency to see the use of the military in the chora as a
Conclusion

Sign of corruption or of declining standards of order but the use of military force by centurions or the friends of centurions reinforced the social order. It was part of the exchange of favours that led to generally peaceful government since it clearly demonstrated authority. Patronage societies can only be controlled by the careful control of the resources of power which include military force and the centurions were in a key position to control large networks of patronage and power. The administration of justice and taxation remained firmly in the hands of the nome authorities. This seems problematic but in a world of personal politics, to have two people performing similar administrative functions in the same area does not necessarily cause rivalry. Power was a personal matter, as demonstrated by Gemellus Horion whose influence depended upon his ability to gain access to the authorities. The centurion exercised power and the uses he put that power to were, more or less, up to him. In such circumstances it is pointless to try and discover his administrative remit but if we free ourselves from an overly legalistic view, we can see the centurions in their true light.

From the history of the institutions of the army, I move in the second half of the thesis to the history of the individual soldier. The army was composed, initially, of foreigners. Strangers in countries that might often have
been hostile, but time is important. My period covers over two hundred years of history. The ancient world appears to many as essentially static, especially compared with the great changes that have altered the fundamental structure of our society in the last hundred years or so. It is sometimes difficult to imagine any change in the lives of the Egyptian peasants over millennia. The economic structure of Mediterranean society in global terms seems to change very little over long periods of time and this sometimes leads the ancient historian to be negligent of chronology but time is an important factor in the lives of individuals. The cycles of change in the villages are of significance to the villagers, as families rose and fell, as the village itself fluctuated over a period of time. My period of study is eight generations and, in terms of military service, nine or ten generations of soldiers. The soldiers who came as strangers, outsiders and foreigners in 31 B.C. would have been completely replaced by a new generation by 6 B.C. and the Egyptian population would have been renewed, now familiar with Roman domination. Another twenty-five to thirty years and there would be virtually no survivors of the pre-Roman era. Although the overall structure of society might change only very slowly, the personnel changed very rapidly. Although new recruits might still come from outside Egypt, the evidence points to a gradual shift to local recruiting and we might wonder at how significant external
recruitment was. Italian or Western recruits might bring distinctly separate cultural influences to Egypt but the cultural interchanges of the Eastern Mediterranean had almost certainly lead to much bilingualism and many people might have been able to adapt to and even adopt different cultural values. The soldiery and the population would have had no problem in communicating and after twenty or twenty-five years of practising the veterans would have emerged able to blend in to the dominant cultural environment. When we look at the veterans in Karanis, we find that the veterans fitted into village society without noticeable problems. It is clear that many of the veterans were culturally Graeco-Egyptians from a very early date.

The soldiers clearly integrated into Egyptian society. The idea of the soldiery forming a socially distinct military caste, settling in their own communities and even after discharge trying desperately to maintain their military connections has been shown to be at least dubious. The settlement patterns of the veterans were complex but it is clear that the veterans we see did not settle in veteran communities. There seems to have been no clear reason for the concentration of veterans in the North-east Fayum, though factors such as the origins of soldiers, area of service, quality and availability of land, and perhaps such
things as the reputation of an area amongst soldiers and even chance may have had a role to play.

Karanis provided us with a very complete picture of one the communities in which these veterans chose to settle. What we see is a fairly normal Egyptian village. The material culture of the village was poor. None of the villagers seem to have been rich. We see an economy based on agriculture, mainly grain. The village itself seems to have little contact with the outside world. There is no sign of an extensive trade and most of the pottery was locally produced. There is a distinct lack of anything that might suggest wealth, such as fine ware pottery. Even the lamps seem to have been overwhelmingly from the surrounding area and not imported from other Mediterranean cultures. The architecture shows distinct similarities with other Fayum villages and is not socially differentiated. The public space of the village was dominated by the two Egyptian temples. The material culture clearly shows that this veteran community was thoroughly Graeco-Egyptian. But what makes Karanis special is the information about the actual social dealings of the population. Here we see the individual members of the community living out their lives. The veterans were not a socially distinct group. They tended to come from a certain sector of the community but did not form a separate group. Although many of the documents
concern Romans and Antinoopolites, their social life also involved large numbers of people who should be identified with the Graeco-Egyptian population. The evidence here shows quite clearly that the veterans and soldiers cannot be seen as the cultural storm troopers of Romanisation.

The position of the veterans in the community is clearly demonstrated by a detailed study of their legal position. Here we see the government generally attempting to elevate the soldiery: giving them special privileges and rights and, most importantly, the Roman citizenship itself. But the detailed papyrological evidence sees the privileges coming under threat or even being ignored by the authorities. The picture is not uniform since some veterans managed to maintain their privileges in the face of this. The individual veterans were not men of great wealth. Some were quite well off in the villages of the chora, some came from families that had had privileges previously and had some influence in the local communities, some were able to gain access to the authorities and use the powers of the state in their private quarrels and litigation. Others were not so powerful. They did not wield the same economic and social influence yet all were given similar legal privileges. In the Roman empire legal privilege was a sign of social status and so the socially privileged and powerful sought legal privilege. But some of the veterans, perhaps
the majority, did not enjoy wealth or elevated social status. Their power within the community was not great and thus their privileges were ignored by the authorities. When the powerful veterans defended their privileges, they also defended the privileges of the less powerful but when other sources of privilege became available to them, such as Antinoopolite citizenship, there was not the same protection. The law was all very well but what really counted was the ability of the individual veteran to force the authorities to apply the law. This was dependant upon social and political influence which, when the veterans saw themselves as distinct from the native community, might have been very great but later was dependant on the individual.

We see in Egypt the provincialisation of the army. The legions remained Roman but what Roman meant was changing. For the villagers of the nomes of Egypt, Roman quickly lost cultural or social meaning, becoming a mere legal designation. The whole process puts the Constitutio Antonina into a different perspective. The whole of the Mediterranean had not become Roman, nor was Roman citizenship enjoyed by a huge proportion of the population but the basis of empire had changed. The emperors had broken away from the idea that it was an empire of Rome or an empire of Italy as the culture of the aristocracies of the Empire became more uniform. Once this had happened, the
institutions of Roman citizenship became anomalous. Low status veterans or freedmen might have a higher legal status than a great land owner, controlling vast tracts of land and networks of patronage.

This is the history of the army at the level of the individual. The rhetoric of the lawyers and the politicians of the Roman elite sought to divide the army from the peoples which it controlled. The army was to be a distinct part of society. But this was a rhetorical position which was virtually untenable in the world of the individual. For the ancient historian even more than for the modern historian, the temptation is to play out history at this rhetorical level. The vast majority of our sources produce history of the great men, or at least history of the men and women who form part of the elite of ancient culture. Even if we move away from the concerns of the politics of the elite to the society that surrounds them, we still see that society and the institutions of that society from the viewpoint of the elite. Modern social science often does not help. There is a tendency to look for the overall view, ironing out anomalies with the powerful tool of statistics and reducing situations and peoples to dominant features. The Mediterranean economy then assumes a basically static appearance and the structure of life remains constant. But ancient life was not played out on the level of the
Mediterranean state, it was played in thousands of individual transactions, in individual relationships and in the interplay of personal power relations. At this local level, rules get broken or ignored, principles do not apply and grand generalisations from the rest of the empire are made mockery of. The local rule breaking, the mass of local situations, had a cumulative, complex, varied impact which has immense implications for the history of the Roman army and of the Roman empire.
Notes
III Military Establishment

1. S. Daris (1988), goes through much of this information. It has been necessary to use certain unorthodox abbreviations in the tables in this chapter.

I. Memnon = A. Bernand & E. Bernand (1960).


I. Koptos = A. Bernand (1972).

2. J. Lesquier (1918) 40-72; Ch. IV p. 84-93.


4. J. Lesquier (1918), 56.

5. J. Lesquier (1918), 40-50.

6. J. Lesquier (1918), 54-55. See Ch. IV p. 89.

7. CIL III 25; Jos. 3J III 8.

8. Jos. 3J VII 19; VI 418; VII 117.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality
10. See Ch. VII, p. 159-50.


12. C. Römer (1920).

13. BGU XI 2970; BGU II 378 = n. Car. II 88; S& LV 7367; P. Lond p. 152 II 196.

14. This diploma is incomplete but the discovery of the diploma of 179, see n. 12, considerably lessens the difficulties presented by the document.

15. CIL XVI 1; 2. See Aia Paullini and the M. Frasri, Aelii Habeti, and sigri cohorts for early cohorts.


17. For the role and position of these officers see Ch. VII, p. 163-194.

18. CIL XVI 134; C. Römer (1920).


20. S. H. A. Ant. Pius. V 4; Pausanias VIII 43.3; CIL VI 1203.

22. See Ch. IV p. 84-93.

23. It is possible that the units did have prefects but that these never ventured out of Lower Egypt.


25. Augustus introduced emergency measures to recruit freedmen into the army. Velleius II 110.7; Dio LXV 31.1; Macrobius I 11.32; Suet. Aug. 25.2.

26. See below, p. 63-73.


28. CIL XVI 35.

29. M. Speidel (1981), details the evidence for the existence of this unit but does not discuss the possibility of the development of the unit over time.

30. Strabo 17.1.12.

31. Strabo 17.1.30.
32. Strabo 17.1.41.

33. M. Speidel (1982a). Speidel's case rests upon an early inscription from the Thebaid which was set up by the Praefectus castrorum of the camp in the Thebaid. Speidel then asserts that the praefectus castrorum was an office confined to the camps of legions and so there must have been a camp of legionaries in the Thebaid during the first-century. The argument rather relies upon the assertion that there were no such officers in charge of auxiliary camps at this period and is therefore, basically, an argument from silence. It is not a desperately strong case. However, if we were to suggest a possible garrison for this third legion, the Thebaid would be a very strong contender.

34. Tac. Ann. IV 5.

35. Tac. Hist. I 70.

36. Tac. Ann. XV 36. For Nero's interest in Egypt see below. The evidence has been collected in M. T. Griffin (1934), 229; D. Braund (1986), argues that Nero was planning an invasion of the Caspian Gates through Egypt. If the sense of geography was as bad as Braund alleges then this would account for the large build up of troops in Egypt. See n. 9 and p. 82.
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53. Juvenal *Satire* XV 1-11.

54. W.S. Anderson (1988), points to the racist attitudes evident in the satire and suggests that the attitudes were foreign to Juvenal who was presenting a deliberately flawed picture. I am not disposed to see this attitude as a literary posture.


56. Xenophon of Ephesus III 12.

57. Xenophon of Ephesus IV 1.

58. Xenophon of Ephesus IV 3-4.

59. J. Winkler (1980), tends not to believe in the historicity of the stories concerning the Boukoloi demonstrates the standard elements within the description of the revolt and bandit activities in the second- and third-century sources. His case is weakened since he does not use the papyrological evidence which explains elements of the story that Winkler finds difficult.
VI Bandits and Rebels

60. **BSU I 372 = W.Carr. 19** The edict has been re-edited with commentary. S. Strassi Zaccaria (1983).

61. **P.Fay.** 24.

62. **P.Oxy. XII 1403.**

63. **BSU I 323.**

64. **P.Ant. II 87.**

65. **J.D.Thomas (1975).**

66. **Tac. Hist. I 11.**

67. **Philo In Flaccum 83–93.**

68. **Philo In Flaccum 5.**

69. **Eusebius HE VI 40.**

70. **G.Chalon (1964).** Chalon notes the slight evidence of economic problems in the period but notes the elements of propaganda in the edict. It may well be that the edict was designed to herald the beginning of a new era by tackling long-standing problems. There is then no reason to see the
edict as a response to a single specific event. *P. Oxy* I 1100; *BGU* 64σ.

71. S. Strassi Zaccaria (1988), 15 suggests that the problem of anacnoresis was greater in the second-century than in the first. She has also collected in an appendix all known cases of anacnoresis.

72. E. J. Hobsbawm (1969), 15. Hobsbawm's study of modern banditry suggests that banditry only flourishes when the modern state is not able to bring force to bear on the communities involved for whatever reason. "An efficient modern state like France after the Revolution could liquidate the huge epidemic of (non-social) brigandage which swept the Rhineland during the 1790s, in a few years".

73. E. J. Hobsbawm (1969). The field of bandit studies is large and complex but nearly all modern discussion takes Hobsbawm's work as a starting point over twenty years after its publication. P. O'Malley (1979). See below n. 74-77.

74. B. D. Shaw (1964), 4. Shaw offers by far the fullest and most interesting study of banditry in the Roman world.

75. B. D. Shaw (1984), 23. "the bandit was a non-person, a judgement reflected not just in the law but also in upper class thought in general where bandits are lumped together
with the other outcasts of Graeco-Roman society: slaves and the insane". E.J. Hobsbawm (1969), 72. "The robber band is outside the social order which fetters the poor, a brotherhood of the free, not a community of the subject."

T.W. Gallant (1989), 271. "There is in song a marked bi-polar opposition between bandits and peasants- free and unfree, natural and supernatural". A.J.L. Van Hooff (1988), 112 "The robber furnishes the poet with an antipole of the decent human being, as an anti-man".


77. A. Blok (1972), A. Blok (1974). c.f. L. Lewin (1979), 118. "Given the contemporary context in which the cangaceiro has been interpreted, the tendency in much of the scholarly literature has been to emphasize the socially positive side of the bandit by exaggerating his identity as a champion of the people. Unfortunately the effect of this interpretation has been to obscure, even to deny, the cangaceiro's historical role as an instrument for maintaining the established order on behalf of local agrarian elites".

78. G. Chalon (1964), 53 discusses the edict as a piece of propaganda.

79. The evidence for the use of local levies comes only from the Jewish revolt but the papyrological evidence is much
better for the suppression of the revolt than in the revolt of the Boukolia. The revolt of the Boukolia was a native revolt so the Romans might not have raised levies but it is probable that the authorities were able to raise troops and control sizable elements of the Egyptian population.
1. R.W. Davies (1974), collects the source material for the various activities of the Roman army and groups it by activity. The range of activity is important but it is difficult to come to any conclusions about whether these activities were actually part of the daily life of the Roman soldier.


3. P.Wash.Univ. I 7 is the only parallel that I have been able to find and this use of soldiers on the canals is dated to the fifth or sixth century.

4. See Ch. VI p.126f.

5. BGU III 597.

6. BGU IV 1103.

7. P.Oxy. XLII 3023.

8. ChLA IV 264, see Ch. III.

9. BGU III 802.

10. SB VI 9223.
VII Peacetime Activities

11. P. Oxy. Hel. 14. The editor has appended a bibliography to this document.

12. OGIS II 660 = A. Bernand (1972), No. 41 = CIG 4716 = SB 8580.

13. CIL III 29. See Ch. IV, p. 91.

14. OGIS II 673.

15. CIG 4713e = Inscr. Mus. Cairo p. 34 No. 9277.

16. SB X 10530.

17. CIL III 6527. See Ch. III p. 63-73.

18. IGRR I 1142.

19. CIL III 13539.

20. IGRR I 1044.


22. AE 1952 No. 249.

23. CIL III 12043.
24. CIL III 1357ς.

25. O. Florida 2.

26. O. Florida 24; 26; O. Amst. 9; 10; 13.

27. O. Amst. 8; 13; 14.

28. S. E. Sidebotham (1986) 62. "There were no fixed distances between the water points in the Eastern Desert. Their locations did not necessarily represent the distances one could travel in a single day. Most water points were so close together that a fast traveller could visit two or three in a day's journey."

29. O. Florida 12; 6.

30. O. Florida 5.


32. O. Florida 5.

33. O. Florida 9.

35. O. Amst. 2; O. Florida 3. The reeds may have been kept for signalling purposes or just as fuel.

36. O. Guerard 'Ostraka grecs et latines de l'Wadi Fawakhir,' *BIFAO* 41, (1942) 141-196. See especially No. 14 for the date of the archive and the hunting of wild beasts.


38. P. Rein. II 95.

39. R. S. Bagnall (1977). See also R. S. Bagnall (1975), P. J. Sijpesteijn (1973), which illuminate the situation further up the Nile and show that it was probably similar.


41. SB V 8539.

42. P. Oslo. II 30.

43. SB X 10308.

44. SB I 5233.
VII Peacetime Activities

45. _P.Oxy._ Xiv 2234.

46. _P.Ryl._ II 141.

47. A.E. Hanson (1989), details the career of Nemesion. The documents we are concerned with are _P.Corn._ inv. 90 and _P.Mich._ X 582.


49. _BGU_ I 36; II 433.

50. _BGU_ III 905.

51. _P.Ryl._ II 81.

52. _P.Ryl._ II 70.

53. _P.Amh._ II 77.

54. _P.Grenf._ I 47.

55. _BGU_ II 525.

56. _SPP_ XXII 55.

57. _P.Hamb._ I 10.
VII Peacetime Activities

58. P. Tebt. II 304.

59. P. Thmouis I 110.

60. See Ch. VI, p. 120.


62. BGU I 4 = BGU XV 2458.

63. SB X 11904.

64. P. Ryl. II 73.

65. P. Petaus 123.


67. BGU I 61.

68. BGU II 651.

69. BGU II 515.

70. BGU II 454.


73. P. Mil. Vo.1. II 73.

74. SB VI 9290 = Daris 69.

75. SB XIV 12179.

76. SPP XXII 54.

77. BGU VII 1676.

78. P. Tebt. II 334.

79. SPP XXII 49.

80. SB X 10519 = P. Alex+Giss. 3. See also CIL III 6581 and P. Hamb. I 39.


82. P. Gen. I 17.

83. BGU I 98.

84. P. Grenf. II 52.
VII Peacetime Activities

85. SPP XXII 87.

86. P.Oslo. II 23.

87. BGU I 275.

88. BGU I 321; 322 = SB I 6.

89. BGU I 157.

90. P.Fay. 38 = Daris 70 = ChLA III 207.

91. P.Oxy. IX 1185.

92. P.Tebt. II 333.

93. SB VI 9203.

94. SB X 10270.13.

95. P.Harr. II 200.


97. P.Oxy. XIV 1637.

98. P.Stras. III 150.
99. SB V 3004.

100. PSI III 222 = Daris 81.


102. BGU XIII 2352.

103. P. Hil. Vo: 1. IV 234.

104. P. Oxy. IV 747.

105. P. Oxy. I 64.


107. PSI III 134; 222.


110. For a selection of crimes from Roman Egypt see R.W. Davies (1973), which supersedes B. Baldwin (1963).

111. These village officers are frequently attested. The archephebos appears at least 70 times in the first three
centuries A.D.. The "sword bearers" are attested about 15 times including, on one occasion, a "chief sword bearer". P. Mich. XII 656.

112. See Ch. XI, p.293-303.

113. P. Wisc. II 45.

114. SB I 5230.

115. P. Wisc. I 70.

116. See Ch. VI, p.123-5.

117. See Ch. VI, p.123.


119. In the following examples I do not include the numerous references to soldiers and centurions being used to defeat bandit armies or to put down messianic movements in Palestine or to arrest prominent persons. These constitute an important use of the army by the emperors, but these are not the direct analogies that are needed here. For the importance of bandits and their influence in the Roman Empire see B. D. Shaw (1984) and Ch. VI, p.140-8.
VII Peacetime Activities


121. Pliny Ep. X 77; 78.

122. Mark 15.39; 44.


126. Dio LXI 19.


128. Dio LXXIII 2.

129. Dio LXXVII 10.


131. The Martyrdoms of Ptolemaios and Lucius 10 Musurillo dates this text to the mid-second century on the strength of Urbicus who he identifies with the city prefect Q. Lollius.
VII Peacetime Activities

Urbicus at Rome. However, the martyrdom has a strong Eastern flavour. The woman's husband conducted the affair from Alexandria.

132. Tertullian *Apol.* 2.7.

133. *ILS* 2487 + 9133 = *CIL* VIII 2532 + 18042.


135. Ch. V, p.115. It is possible to see the use of the army against the Jews as a measure to reduce their status.

136. F. Millar (1931), affirms the generally realistic tone of the novel's background in contrast to the fantastic elements of the main plot. He also shows that the novel was set c.A.D. 120-140.

137. Apuleius *The Golden Ass* VII 5-9. The story is told by the hero of the episode who was an aristocratic youth in love with the heroine. The whole story is a fiction meant to fool the robbers, and succeeds in doing so, leading to the eventual capture of the robbers, Lucius the ass and, as the story is told through his eyes, the audience.

138. Apuleius IX 39f
139. M. Sasel Kos (1978). The inscription reads "C. Valerius C.f. Quir. Valens Cam., soldier of legion VIII Augusta, century of Senucio, lived for 35 years, served 14 years. Heirs from the will erected the monument." There are very similar examples from other areas RIB 17, 492, with 491 showing identical iconography but representing a centurion. There is also the relatively well-known figure of the centurio regionarii, e.g. RIB 152, possibly the equivalent of the Greek centurion "over the places".

140. Fink 9 = Daris 10 = ChLA I 7 = CPL 105. Fink has a bibliography of other discussions of the document.

141. Fink 50.

142. Fink 10. The whole of the verso appears as CPL 106 = Daris 10 = ChLA I p. 12-15.

143. Fink 37.

144. Fink 68. See Ch. IX for a full discussion of this document.

145. The entry is harena.
146. Fink is unable to provide an adequate explanation for this entry and notes that the syntax of the phrase is unclear.

147. P. Hamb. I 39 = Fink 76.
VIII Recruitment and Veteran Settlement


2. G. Webster (1932), WO. "Recruitment became more and more dependant upon the frontier peoples, until the army forming the frontier garrisons became almost a hereditary caste."


4. CIL III 6580. The readings are revised by R.P. Wright (1941).

5. AE 1955 No. 238 + AE 1969 No. 633. This inscription was missed by Mann. J.C. Mann (1983).

6. For the period up to the arrival of II Traiana these are CIL III 6599, 6602, 6603, 6605, 6607, 12059, 14183. For the second-century there are CIL III 6511, 6596, 12056. These inscriptions all come from Alexandria.


8. See J.C. Mann (1983), Table 29, pp. 154-5. I find that I do not agree with some of Mann's selection of evidence but the figures are in accordance with the general picture and the discordances are marginal. There is a problem over how accurate the tombstone evidence is. It does not seem likely that Egyptians would always include their origins on the...
VIII. Recruitment and Veteran Settlement

inscriptions if they were of the same origin as the vast majority of the soldiers and there is a question as to what causes a soldier to pick up the epigraphic habit. Also many of the inscriptions from Egypt come from Alexandria and this may have had some effect on the balance of the evidence. It seems safer to concentrate attention on the discharge inscriptions which record the discharge of every soldier in that unit for the particular year. Even so, we cannot be sure that the evidence reflects an average year's intake, if there was such a thing.

9. Fink 74 = PSI IX 1063.

10. Tac. Ann. XII 32.5. Tacitus comments on the creation of the Roman colony at Colchester that it was set up to protect the country against revolt and present the locals with an example of ordered Roman government.


13. BGU II 587.


15. P.Oxy. III 653.

17. H. I. Bell (1940). It seems possible that the racial purity side of the foundation of the city has been over-emphasised in discussions. p.145 "The grant of *epigamia* (conubium) by its founder opened up a dangerous avenue to Egyptianisation. No doubt despite some modern racial theories, Hellenism, like other national characteristics, is less a matter of blood than of culture and tradition, but the survival of a cultural tradition threatened by an alien environment is probably helped by racial purity."

18. A. Aly (1982), 159-179, fully summarises the material on Antinoopolis.

19. H. I. Bell (1940), "Those [veterans] at present known as Antinoites did not become citizens until the reign of Antoninus Pius and it seems likely that about that time an attempt was made to increase the population of the city.


21. BGU I 305.

22. BGU I 581.

23. BGU I 179.
24. CPL 223.

25. SB XII 11103.

26. Only two diplomas mention settlement. CIL X 867 and 333. Both these deal with two veterans from the fleet at Misenum who were assigned to the colony at Paestum. The number of veterans who were discharged in this manner into a veteran colony must have been quite small since veterans had normally founded their own communities prior to the granting of colonial status in the imperial period and so if there was a special discharge of soldiers when the decision was taken to found a colony, this discharge would have only been a supplement to the existing veterans. We would not be able to trace such a practice very easily in our partial documentation.

27. BGU I 113; I 265.

28. SB IV 7362. The document dates from A.D.133-5 and the veteran was discharged in 177. SB VI 9228 dates from 160 and the veteran was discharged in 155.

29. There is an extensive bibliography on epikrisis documentation. Those documents dealing with veterans are P.Hamb. I 30; 31a; BGU I 113; 265; III 780; 847; SB IV 7362; VI 9228. The documents are discussed in A.Aly (1932), 67f;
Lesquier (1916), 163-203; and most fully and recently C.A. Nelson (1979). The documents do present a problem in that veterans of the legions are not mentioned. It seems probable that they were subsumed under the title of Romans and not in any of the inferior status groups.

30. Mann. (1903), 61. This is one of the main results of Mann's studies. "That a high proportion of veterans did in fact prefer to settle where they had served is sufficiently clear, and one result of this was that many of the colonies of this period arose on sites of former legionary fortresses where legionary veterans had already begun to settle."

31. The table here lists veterans and soldiers identified with Karanis before 250. All dates are A.D. All references are to one document, if possible, and soldiers may appear in other texts. For the units see Ch. III. It is possible that some of the veterans and soldiers mentioned here were not resident at Karanis and that I have omitted a few of the military. These are matters of subjective judgement but I believe that the overall numbers are about right.

32. See Ch. XI, p.293-4 for the population of Karanis.

33. I. Biezunska-Malowist (1975), E.G. Turner (1952). One of the few veterans attested in the material is L. Pompeius Niger who is discussed by J.E.G. Whitehouse (1988) with
references to other discussions. The discrepancy in the numbers of veterans produced in each district was noted by C. Wessely (1902). This has been further elaborated by D. H. Samuel (1931). Samuel notes that there are very few Romans attested in the village and those that are attested were either officials or non-residents. This may be because the village was primarily a religious centre with little or no farm land.

34. E. M. Husselman (1979), 55-5.


38. See Ch. X, p. 263-71.


3. P.A. Brunt (1950), 51; Tac. Ann. I 17.6

4. Suet. Dom. 7.3

5. Dio LXII 3

6. Herodian III 8 4; cf S.H.A. Sever. XII 2

7. Fink 10, 37, 50, 9


10. The figures are then taken from the stipendium and not the stipendium itself. Fink comments in his introduction to 70 on this problem. "A word may now be said about the form stipendi... Except for the mention of secundum stipendium, this might be read as stipendi for stipend(ium) (primum); and there is still the question of whether it is to be taken as stipendi(um), the object of accipit, or as stipendi, a partitive genitive. If the latter, then Watson's contention that the odd amounts of the pay in 68 and 70 represent only
a part of the total due finds support; but I see no way of deciding the matter." See also G.R.Watson (1956).


14. D.J.Breeze (1971), 134. "The transfer of Maximus apparently took place in a time of warfare when abnormal conditions could pertain while Maximus himself may have been prepared to accept a reduction in pay in return for better promotion prospects." Breeze and Doolson have summarized their position on pay "The distinction between the men of the legion and men of the auxilia between cavalrymen of the alae and cavalrymen of the mixed cohorts, and infantry of the cohorts showed in pay scales. The legionary was at the top of the scale, the auxiliary infantryman at the bottom. The only precise figures are for the legionary; estimates of the auxiliary infantryman's pay vary between one-third of a legionary's and two-thirds or five-sixths. The former is preferred here, because it is easier to build a logical structure on it; we do not believe that a man in an ala was paid as much as or more than a legionary." D.J.Breeze & B.Doolson (1987). One assumption that is always made in these analyses is that the differences in status between the
auxiliary units and the legionaries were reflected in the pay scales. The differences between legionary and auxiliary were not great in Egypt, at least amongst veterans, if we judge by legal privilege, and the status differential between soldiers of the different types gradually disappeared. This general impression is reinforced by the consideration of "P. Oxy. XIV 1660. The editors dated this to the third century on the basis of the hand. The letter details actions taken to transfer a legionary to an ala. The transfer was accomplished by the father of the soldier but only after a great deal of disruption and a personal visit to Alexandria. If the transfer had been to a low status, low pay unit from a high status, high pay unit, it is difficult to understand the evident problems. The document certainly becomes more comprehensible if the transfer from the legion to an auxiliary unit did not bring about a loss of status or pay. The implication of this transfer is that the status of the son in the legion was not diminished by the transfer and so his pay either remained the same or, as he was moving from an infantry unit to a cavalry unit, was increased by the move. It has long been known that from an early date there were people serving in the legions who were probably not Roman citizens at enlistment and that there were auxiliaries who were probably Roman citizens. Although neither piece of information counts as proof of equal status and equal pay, both suggest this.
15. Tac. Hist. I 19

15. Dio LV 23. The "others" is often translated here as "legionaries" which must be correct in the context of A.D. 5, but when Dio was writing the "others" must almost certainly have included the auxiliaries as well. This is not good evidence for the payment of such rewards to the auxiliaries, but there is no indication that auxiliaries were not granted these financial rewards.

17. See Ch. VIII, p. 219-11.

2. BGU II 321.

3. CPL 104.

4. BGU I 140.

5. All published diplomas have been collected in CIL XVI and by M. M. Roxan in RMD I and RMD II. The first two extant diplomas are from A.D. 52 and A.D. 54: CIL XVI 1 & 2. The first "regular" diplomas are Flavian: CIL XVI 16. The change in the nature of the diploma in the 140s is shown in CIL XVI 88–90. The late series of diplomas begins with CIL XVI 133. These later diplomas are records of the grant of privileges to veterans of the fleet or of units stationed in Rome.

6. BGU V 1210, P. Oxy. XLII 3014.

7. BGU V 1210 34-35; Dig. XXIX 1.1 tells us which emperors granted privileges; 1.11; 1.38; 1.21; 1.15.6; 1.34.1; 1.42; XXVIII.3.6.7; Jos. J VI.18. J. B. Campbell (1934), 207-229.

8. Dig. XXVIII 2.26

9. Dig. XXIX 1.32.2-3. The measure comes between the modifications of the position relating to wives and heirs by
Claudius and by Hadrian. This really means that the Flavians are favourites to implement this measure though Trajan should not be ruled out.

10. BGU I 140.

11. BGU V 1020.

12. P. Col. VII 188 is from Karanis but dates from A.D. 320. There are documents dealing with the distribution of property after the death of a veteran but they do not give any details of the form of the will.

13. BGU I 325, c.f. 327.

14. CPL 213.

15. CPL 220.


18. M. Car. II 372.


21. CPL 104.

22. CIL XVI 88; 90.

23. CIL XVI 92; 95; 96.

24. For the difficulty of distinguishing Romans from other classes see H.C. Youtie (1975).

25. BGU V 1020, 43; 53; 55.


29. M. Valerius Turbo was a prominent member of the veteran community at Philadelphia. His will is BGU VII 1655, cf 1652. For the family see also BGU VII 1692, 15987, 1565, 1574, 1575, 1657, P. Gen. II 97.
30. **Dig. L.4.18; 4.1; 4.12; 4.13.24; 5.7; 4.3; XXXXIX.13.2.**

31. N. Lewis (1982), 144-145; F. Oertel (1917) 392; 396f.

32. **BGU I 255.**

33. **BGU I 180.**

34. **P. Wurz 9.**

35. **BGU VIII 1634.**


37. **P. Oxy. XXX/I 276J.**

38. **P. Phil. 1.**

39. **Dig. XXXXIX.13.1; 13.3.**

40. SB V 7523. This is a witnessed statement that C. Maevius Apella, veteran of ala Apriana had been beaten on the order of the **strategos** at Philadelphia in the Arsinoite.

41. **CJ II 51.1. J. B. Campbell (1984), 241.**

42. **Dig. XXXXIX.16.9; 16.13; BGU V 1020.111.**
43. Tac. Ann. XIII. 51.

44. J.B. Campbell (1973).

45. Dio LX 24.3.

46. Gaius Inst. 2.110

47. BGU I 140

49. P. Garnsey (1970b), Herodian 3.6.4-5.


50. Dig. L.2.9

51. CPL 117 = PSI IX 102ω.


53. For a discussion of this type of document see Ch. VIII, p.218-22ω.

54. BGU I 113; 265.

56. *ILS* 9060.


58. *P.Oxy. LV* 3798 shows the children of a veteran proudly proclaiming that his name had been inscribed on the stele in Rome.

59. *CPL* 104. See also *CPL* 105.

60. *P. Fouad* 21; *Sb* V 8247. This document is discussed by C.B. Welles (1933), A. Segre (1940), W.L. Westermann (1941), S. Daris (1962), G. Chalon (1964), 64-66.

61. *PSI IX* 1026 = *CPL* 117.


63. *BGU* III 747.

64. Campbell (1984), 207.

65. Campbell (1984), 228.


68. Herodian 3.3.4-5.


70. Suet. Vesp. 6.

71. For army pay in the late empire see R. P. Duncan-Jones (1973).

72. P. Garnsey (1970b), Herodian 3.3.4-5.

73. J. B. Campbell (1978), 154. The attitude of the Roman government towards sex and the soldier seems to be extremely complex. We could interpret the ruling on marriage as a decree to try and enforce celibacy, a wonderfully impractical policy, or just to keep the soldiery free of civilian ties. Tac. Ann. III 33-4 is an account of a debate in the Senate of whether governors should be allowed to take their wives with them to provinces. The debate is essentially practical. It seems unlikely that there was much concern about the celibacy of the soldiers. P. Brown studied the pre-Christian attitudes towards sexuality: "Concern for the deportment and medical science converged on the issue of intercourse. The body was a fragile reservoir from which vital energy might leak away. Its fires had to be carefully banked up if they were to last. Frequent sexual activity was frowned upon. Ejaculation brought about an appreciable
The lover and the uxorious did not merely sink into a suspect state of emotional dependence on a woman; physiologically, their progressive loss of heat threatened to make them 'womanish'. "P. Brown (1988), 18. Virility was linked to sexual abstinence but this does not seem to have caused the Romans undue problems as long as their sexuality was properly controlled and I feel that it is most likely that the law was designed for social reasons rather than to produce more manly soldiers.

74. Digest XXIX.1.1

75. K. Hopkins (1973), 74f.

76. H.Gmr. I 372.

77. This kind of conclusion which sees the development of law as a historic practice were the law that any country has is always an historic creation, often created in very specific historical circumstances, and not necessarily bearing a relationship to contemporary society is a theme of Watson's work. A. Watson (1931), 1. "The Western legal tradition is basically unitary, and much of the same historical, legal elements have gone into the creation of the law of each nation state: Roman law, Germanic customs, canon law, feudal law, and so on. Yet the great bulk of
Modern Western systems are divided into common law systems that derive from English law, civil law systems that have an important historical connection—though not always easy to define—with Roman law, and mixtures of the two. This truth remains despite, on the one hand, overwhelming joint social and economic circumstances, such as the industrial revolution, in civil law and common law countries alike, and on the other hand, disparate political regimes, ranging from democracy to despotism, within a group of systems. As a result, the similarities between any two civil systems are greater than between civil law systems and common law systems. Watson argues that in developed systems, with specialist lawyers the law develops without "too much concern with the concerns of society." A. Watson (1985), 42. We may doubt whether the law of the Roman empire was quite so remote from the concerns of society. Watson is most convincing when looking at modern, professionalised systems but the ancient respect for law and perceptions of unchanging rules points to a similar conservatism within law in Rome. This means that if Augustus, facing a new situation, was to legislate, governed by his own political and social considerations, later figures who might have totally different perceptions and concerns, and indeed be unaware of the reasoning behind the earlier rulings, would be loathe to move away from already established practice, no matter how ridiculous.
1. A.E.R. Boak and E.E. Peterson (1931), A.E.R. Boak (1933), E.M. Husselman (1979), L.A. Shier (1978), B. Johnson (1981), R.E. Haatvedt and E.E. Peterson (1964). In addition to these full length studies there has also been an exhibition of the antiquities with catalogue and numerous other studies of the archaeological and papyrological remains.

2. See Ch. VIII p. 221f.


8. Boak (1933), 5. "The ground plan of the temple...is distinctly Egyptian and presents many points of similarity with that of other local shrines."


14. Petrie inv. 1B/G2; U.C. inv. 31907. There are also P. Hib. II 212 of c. 250 B.C., P. Sorb. I 56 of 215 B.C., SB III 7222 of 229 B.C. The last papyri from the village seem to come from c. A.D. 340.

15. It is very difficult to assess what is "typically Egyptian" in the archaeological record. Most of the material either deals with the representation of the house in art or with the larger houses. Many of the Pharaonic depictions of houses in model or wall painting suggest houses that have colonnaded entrances and obviously belong to a far wealthier group than are represented in the Fayum villages. The main architectural feature that seems common to most houses is the large number of rooms in a small space, one of the factors that makes identifying individual houses at Karanis extremely difficult, and the central living room off which all other rooms lead. Some of these features may be found elsewhere in the Mediterranean world but it is extremely difficult to trace the cultural heritage of this kind of architecture and I feel that there is enough evidence to be
reasonably confident that these structures are native Egyptian in character. E.B. Smith (1938), A. Badawy (1966), H. Maenier (1983).


19. B. Johnson (1981). Fine ware No. 203-207. Red Slip No. 213-254. It is difficult to find an adequate Egyptian site to compare to Karanis. A completely different kind of site Quseir Al-Qadim has produced quite large amounts of fine ware and amphorae. D.S. Whitcomb and J.H. Johnson (1982), 52-69. Large numbers of Roman lamps have also been found at the site. (p. 243) It is to be noted that this site had no agricultural hinterland.


22. R.K. Enders "The Remains of Wild and Domestic Animals" in Boak (1933), 90f. H. Kees (1961), 226 notes that the Fayum was the finest hunting ground in the whole of Egypt.

24. H. Geremek (1969), 37 used a much higher multiple to calculate the population trying to use material from Roman Egypt. I think that the figures used are too high.

25. A.E.R. Boak (1955). Geremek (1969), 37 accepts the figures for the absolute numbers of Romans. My own researches using only the indices of the aforementioned tax registers would suggest that the Roman element around was around 14.5% of the total population which is in accordance with Boak's estimates. There is no reasonable case to be made out that these did not form a citizen group that essentially consisted of veterans and their families. It is difficult to envisage the processes that would lead to the adoption of Roman citizenship status by this proportion of the population if it were not through military service. There is no evidence for the Roman element within the population from other periods nor any convincing grounds for postulating mechanisms of change within the proportion during the second-century, after the town had reached its peak.

26. The difficulties in this kind of study become apparent when popular names are considered. With a very small number of available names and documents of uncertain date and provenance, it quickly becomes clear that it is impossible
to connect with confidence people of the same name. The situation is further complicated by the capacity of the villagers to use familial designations for all persons of a similar social standing or as a mark of respect whether they are blood related or not. Some relatively successful attempts at uniting the family groups have been produced. H.I. Bell (1950), P.J. Sijpesteijn (1976), H.A. Sanders (1931).

27. 154 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 428 Sale of house.}$
    155 $\text{SB XII 11103 Birth certificate.}$
    172 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 354 Receipt.}$
    172/3 $\text{SB V 7558 Relief from guardianship.}$
    177/3-132/3 $\text{BGU III 782 Iulius Longinus's dealings.}$
    179 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 364 Land registration.}$
    182/5 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 385 Garden taxes receipt book.}$
    183 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 395 Tax receipt.}$
    185 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 386 Tax receipt.}$
    186 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 396 Tax receipt.}$
    188 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 387 Tax receipt.}$
    189 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 370 Census declaration.}$
197(a) $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 422 Petition to the prefect.}$
    197(b) $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 423-4 Petition to the strategos.}$
    198 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 425 Petition to the epistrateos.}$
    199/200 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 426 Petition to the epistrateos.}$
    206 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 397 Tax receipt.}$
    207 $\text{P.}\ \text{Mich. VI 398 Tax receipt.}$
XI Karanis

211/2 SB IV 7351 Petition to the epistratezos.
214 SB IV 7360 Land registration.

28. SB XII 11103. Of the witnesses only C. Domitius Clemens appears elsewhere. In 131, a veteran of that name was a witness to a will from the Arsinoite CPL 220.


139 BGU II 472 Receipt for final payment in deed of sale.


There are other Minucii known in the area but none can be tied into this family.


117-8 P. Fam. Tebt. 18 A. Gemellus Appointed to liturgic post.

122 P. Mich. III 185 M. A. Gemellus Rental of land.


Antoninus Pius BGU III 709 M. A. Cap[ sale of land.

141 P. Phil. 11 C. A. Numisianus Division of land.

150/173 P. Phil. 12 L. A. Germanus Lease of property.

152/3 P. Amh. II 92 M. A. Capitolinus. Leasing of oil retail rights.

166/9 P. Mich. XII 629 M. A. Gemellus Request to remain in Karanis.

172 SB V 7558 Petition for a relief from guardianship.
172-3 P. Mich. IV 223, 2314; 224, 3533; M. A. Capitolinus.
172-3 P. Mich. IV 224, 3752; 5140; 5423; M. A. Gemellus.
174 P. Gen. II 108 Tax payment.
194 B6U I 326 M. A. Petronianus Opening of will.
176 B6U II 668 A. Capitolinus. Owner of olive grove.
II (mid) B6U II 513 A. Gemellus Dispute over land.
II PSI VI 704 M. A. In dealings of a different family.

107(b) P. Mich. VIII 466 Apol. Letter to Sabinus.
117/8 P. Mich. IX 549 will of Sambathion.
Hadrianic P. Mich. inv. 5549 (IX 549 n.3) census document.
P. Mich. VIII 496 Apol. Invitation to visit.


33. Grandmother Sambatnion raises the interesting, if unlikely, possibility that the family had a Semitic origin. CPJ III, pp. 43-87 lists the known occurrences of Sambatnions in Egypt.

34. All the documents in this series are undated.

P. Mich. VIII 467 Ter. to Tib. Ter. has joined the fleet.


P. Mich. VIII 470 Fragment in Latin; similar hand to above.


P. Mich. VIII 479 Ter. to Tib. Legal matters involving
Tabethaeus.


P. Mich. VIII 481 Ter. to Tasoucharion.

ChLA V 229 Ter. Fragment in Latin.


36. See A. E. Hanson (1989), for a similar view of village status.


The bibliography contains references only to those works which have been cited in the notes. This means that certain standard works of reference on both the army and Egypt have been omitted.
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