

Exploring the Functions of *Phrourarchiai* and *Phrourarchoi* in Ptolemaic Egypt: An Analysis of the Archive of the *Phrourarchos* Dioskourides (154-145 B.C.)

Haytham A. Qandeil*

Ain Shams University
haitham.qandeil@art.asu.edu.eg

Abstract:

This article seeks to explore the roles assigned to the *phrourarchoi* and the military units known as *phrourarchiai* in Ptolemaic Egypt, based on the archive of the *phrourarchos* Dioskourides (154-145 B.C.) as a primary source. Despite the military role of the *phrourarchiai*, the archive documents reveal that the *phrourarchoi* also had civil functions alongside their military responsibilities.

The article aims to answer the following questions: Why were these military units established? When were the *phrourarchia* established in Herakleopolis and why? What were the ethnicities that formed the principal components of these military units?

The article reveals the role of external threats – primarily represented by Ptolemaic-Selucid hostility – as well as internal threats – represented by Egyptian rebellions following the victory at the Battle of Rafia – in the establishment of *phrourarchiai* by the Ptolemaic kings in strategically significant locations within their kingdom, including the region of Herakleopolis. The article further discloses that Greeks, Jews, and Egyptians served as soldiers in these *phrourarchiai*, based on both direct and indirect evidence. The primary objective of the present paper is to comprehend the role and responsibilities of the *phrourarchos* and the position of the *phrourarchia* in the military structure of the Ptolemies, based on the documentation of Dioskourides, the *phrourarchos*.

Received: 27/03/2024
Accepted: 01/05/2024
Available online: 30/06/2024

The lexicon of ancient Greek fortresses and garrisons is extensive. For example, terms as ἄκρα, which was often situated on the acropolis of a polis, and περιπόλιον could serve as a fundamental element of a garrison and can be found in both literary and epigraphic sources¹. Additionally, φρουραρχία and φρούριον are two terms that are closely associated with the subject of fortresses. While *phourarchia* signifies the entire fortress, including the physical citadel, the office of the *phourarchos*, and the soldiers, *phourion* refers solely to the physical fortress. The commander of a *phourarchia* was referred to as a *phourarchos*, and the men serving under his authority were designated as *phouroi*.

The primary objective of the present paper is to comprehend the role and responsibilities of the *phourarchos* and the position of the *phourarchia* in the military structure of the Ptolemies, based on the documentation of Dioskourides, the *phourarchos*².

1. PHOURARCHIA AND PHOURARCHOS BEFORE THE PTOLEMIES:

The verbs φρουρέω (to guard) and φρουραρχέω (to command a garrison), along with their derivatives (φρουρά; φρουράρχης; φρουραρχία; φρούραρχος, and others), were employed from the Classical through the Byzantine periods. The term φρούραρχος first emerged in our epigraphic sources in SEG 33:34 (Attica, 460/459 B.C.)³. Literary sources began adopting the verb around the same time. In the second book of his Histories, Herodotus provides us with the following information:

‘ἔτιδὲ ἐπ’ ἐμεῦ καὶ Περσέων κατὰ ταῦτὰ αἱ φυλακαὶ ἔχουσι ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ Ψαμμητίχου ἦσαν: καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ἐλεφαντίνῃ Πέρσαι φρουρέουσι καὶ ἐν Δάφνησι. τοὺς ὧν δὴ Αἰγυπτίους τρία ἔτεα φρουρήσαντας ἀπέλυε οὐδεὶς τῆς φρουρῆς: οἷδὲ βουλευσάμενοι καὶ κοινῶ λόγῳ χρησάμενοι πάντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Ψαμμητίχου ἀποστάντες ἦσαν ἐς Αἰθιοπίν.’⁴

‘And still in my time the Persians hold these posts as they were held in the days of Psammitic; there are Persian guards at Elephantine and at Daphnae. Now the Egyptians had been on guard for three years, and no one came to relieve them; so, organising and making common cause, they revolted from Psammitic and went to Ethiopia’.

Herodotus employed the words ‘φρουρέουσι’, ‘φρουρήσαντας’, and ‘τῆς φρουρῆς’ to describe the garrison and their acts of guarding at Elephantine and Daphnae.

Around the same time, the term φρούριον appeared in Aeschylus⁵. Such terms continued to be used in the Classical period as in Thucydides⁶, Plato⁷ and Xenophon⁸.

We encounter the term φρούραρχος at the time of Alexander the Great in the course of events of his settlement of the affairs in Egypt. While the great conqueror was in Memphis, ‘he appointed two of

his fellows to be commanders of garrisons (φρούραρχοι): Pantaleon the Pydnaean in Memphis, and Polemo, son of Megacles, a Pellaeon, in Pelusium⁹. A similar description of the settlement of the affairs in Susa was also related by Arrian: ‘He (*scil.* Alexander) left behind as satrap of the district of Susa Abulites a Persian, and as garrison commander in the citadel of Susa (φρούραρχος), Mazarus one of the Companions, and, as general, Archelaus son of Theodorus’¹⁰.

2. PHROURARCHIAI AND PHROURARCHOI IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT:

During the Hellenistic period, the newly formed kingdoms utilised *phrourarchiai* to safeguard and regulate their external territories¹¹, and Ptolemaic Egypt was not an exception. The first documented *phrourarchia* outside Egypt was established in the city of Amyzon in Caria¹². In a third-century inscription from the city, an Akrananian who was appointed as a *phrourarchos* by the king was praised¹³. Amyzon was not the only overseas possession of the Ptolemies that was overseen by a *phrourarchos*. A decree from Xanthos, the largest city in Lycia as described by Strabo (Strab. 14.3.6), in 260/259 B.C., honoured the *phrourarchos* Pandaros¹⁴.

2.1. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PHROURARCHIAI IN HERAKLEOPOLIS:

Within Egypt, the Ptolemies employed *phrourarchiai* to combat both external and internal threats. The most well-documented *phrourarchos* and *phrourarchia* in Ptolemaic Egypt is Dioskourides, the *hegemon* of the *phrourarchia* at Herakleopolis¹⁵.

The Ptolemies’ construction of *phrourarchiai* at Herakleopolis was the result of two interrelated factors. The first was the strategic location of the city, which had been recognised by Egyptian rulers since the dynastic period¹⁶. The second factor was a series of political events or dangers that threatened the stability of the Ptolemaic kingdom, including Egyptian uprisings after the Battle of Raphia and the invasion of Antiochus IV of Egypt. These threats made it necessary for the Ptolemies to strengthen their control over the country and ensure the safety of their borders, which they accomplished through the establishment of *phrourarchiai* at Herakleopolis and other strategic locations.

As is well-known, Polybius noted that the Ptolemaic army underwent reforms before the Battle of Raphia, which included the recruitment of twenty thousand Egyptians to form an Egyptian phalanx. This phalanx played a crucial role in the Ptolemaic victory in the battle¹⁷. However, Polybius also noted that Philopator’s decision to recruit and arm the Egyptians ultimately proved disastrous¹⁸, as the Egyptians, ‘elated by their victory at Raphia, were no longer disposed to obey orders, but were on the look-out for

a leader and a figurehead, thinking themselves well able to maintain themselves as an independent power, an attempt in which they finally succeeded not long afterwards¹⁹. That was the Great Revolt of 206–186 B.C., which signalled a momentous uprising against Ptolemaic dominion in Upper Egypt, leading to the loss of Ptolemaic suzerainty over the region, which was subsequently governed by indigenous Egyptian pharaohs who rose to power during the rebellion till 186 B.C.²⁰

Diodorus recounts that a resurgence of nationalistic fervour, as well as the dispute between the two sibling kings Ptolemy VI Philometor and Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, fuelled the emergence of a new uprising, spearheaded by an Egyptian named Dionysius Petosarapis, approximately twenty years after the Great Revolt²¹. After the reconciliation of the two kings, Dionysius Petosarapis failed in his attempt to instigate a civil war between the siblings. However, he managed to persuade soldiers who were inclined towards rebellion to join him, amassing a force of four thousand rebels. Ptolemy VI Philometor marched out against them and emerged victorious, killing some and putting others to flight. Dionysius was forced to swim across the river in the nude and retreated into Upper Egypt, where he attempted to incite the populace to revolt once again. However, his efforts were ultimately fruitless, and the revolt was suppressed²².

The significant role played by Upper Egypt in both revolutions is evident from the sequence of events. As a result, it would have been prudent for the Ptolemies to have constructed fortresses with the following objectives: first, to impede any advance of the rebels towards the north; second, to obstruct the rebels from obtaining any aid from the north; and third, to prevent them from seizing the highly fertile rural lands of the Arsinoite *nome*. Given its strategic location on the Bahr Yusef, Herakleopolis was the most suitable site for the construction of such fortresses²³. It is likely that these fortresses were built after the Battle of Raphia and continued to serve these purposes throughout the second and first centuries B.C.²⁴

While we do not have direct evidence, it is plausible that the *phourarchiai* at Herakleopolis played a role in resisting the invasion of Antiochus IV during the Six Syrian War. Antiochus IV invaded Egypt twice²⁵, first in 170 B.C. when he seized Memphis, but he was forced to retreat due to internal issues in his kingdom. His second invasion occurred in 168 B.C. when he was once again forced to abandon his ambitions in Egypt, this time due to the intervention of the Romans, notably Popilius Laenas and his famous vine stick. During his second attack, Antiochus was able to capture the Delta and the Fayum without facing any resistance²⁶. It is possible that the *phourarchiai* at Herakleopolis, among other reasons, impeded the progress of his troops towards Upper Egypt²⁷.

2.2. THE RECONSTRUCTION DATE OF THE *PHROURARCHIA* LINKED TO THE ARCHIVE OF DIOSKOURIDES:

The reconstruction of the *Phrourarchia* at Herakleopolis, where Dioskourides served as the first *Phrourarchos* post-reconstruction, was completed shortly after the 26th regnal year of Ptolemy VI Philometor (156/155 B.C.)²⁸. Evidence from P. Berl. Zill. 1-2 (156 and 155 B.C.) indicates that repair work was being carried out on the existing *phrourion* in Herakleopolis, and a new *phrourion* was under construction at the harbour, supervised by the *strategos* Ptolemaios²⁹. Although the *strategos*' duties were primarily civil by the end of the 3rd century B.C.³⁰, Ptolemaios was assigned military responsibilities to oversee the reconstruction of the *phrourarchia*. This assignment is evident from his aulic title, τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων³¹, highlighting the strategic significance of Herakleopolis and its *Phrourarchia* during this tumultuous period, as noted by Mooren and cited by the editors of the Dioskourides archive³². The subsequent *strategos*, Teres, held a less significant aulic title, τῶν φίλων³³, indicating that the military responsibilities were transferred to the *phrourarchos*.

3. THE ARCHIVE OF DIOSKOURIDES THE *PHROURARCHOS*:

As previously stated, the archive of Dioskourides the *phrourarchos* provides the most comprehensive documentation on the *phrourarchia*'s organisation. In light of this archive, we can discern the multifaceted functions of the *phrourarchos*, which encompass both military and civil responsibilities. The archive of Dioskourides the *phrourarchos* is comprised of eighteen documents that are dispersed across the papyrus collections of Heidelberg, Cologne, Vienna, and Munich. The documents in the archive were published by J. Cowey, K. Maresch, and C. Barnes³⁴.

3.1. THE DOCUMENTS OF THE ARCHIVE:

The first eleven documents of the archive are petitions addressed to Dioskourides in his capacity as commander of the fortress. The five documents from thirteen to seventeen consist of letters, while the eighteenth document provides insight into Dioskourides' personal life as a guarantor for a lease held by his sister, for whom he acted as a legal guardian. In addition to the documents addressed to Dioskourides, the archive also includes a twelfth document that was directed to Hieron³⁵, who was also identified as a *phrourarchos*.

	Document	Date	Origin
1.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 1	16 Oct. 154 B.C.?	Herakleopolis
2.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 2	Before 20 Nov. 154 B.C.?	Herakleopolis
3.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 3	Before 23 Jan. 153 B.C.?	Herakleopolis

4.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 4	Before 12 May 153 B.C.?	Herakleopolis
5.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 5	17 Jan. 146 B.C.?	Herakleopolis
6.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 6	3 Nov. 146 B.C.	Herakleopolis
7.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 7	ca. 153 B.C.?	Herakleopolis
8.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 8= P.Münch. III 52	Mid 2 nd cent. B.C.	Herakleopolis
9.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 9	Mid 2 nd cent. B.C.	Herakleopolis
10.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 10	Mid 2 nd cent. B.C.	Herakleopolis
11.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 11	Mid 2 nd cent. B.C.	Herakleopolis?
12.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 12	Mid 2 nd cent. B.C.	Herakleopolis?
13.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 13	18 Sept. 152 B.C.?	Unknown
14.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 14	Mid 2 nd cent. B.C.	Herakleopolis
15.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 15	31 Aug. 158 B.C. or 30 Aug. 155 B.C.?	Unknown
16.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 16	14 Feb. 151 B.C.?	Unknown
17.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 17	3 Nov. 151 B.C. or 31 Oct. 140 B.C.?	Herakleopolis
18.	P. Phrur. Diosk. 18	14 Nov. 145 B.C.	Herakleopolis

Table 1.1: Documents of the Archive of Dioskourides the Phrourarchos

To gain a better understanding of the *phrourarchos*'s duties, the content of the first twelve documents in the archive, which comprise petitions addressed to the *phrourarchos*, has been succinctly summarised and analysed³⁶.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 1 (henceforth see *Table 1.1* for the dates of the documents of the archive) recounts a petition submitted to Dioskourides by Theon son of Theon τῶν Ἑρμοτίμου | καὶ Μελεάγρου πεζῶν (of the infantry of Hermotimos and Meleagros, l. 4-5), regarding an assault committed against him by a fellow soldier named Iason³⁷ son of Iason who belonged to the same unit. The incident occurred when Iason entered Theon's home while he was dining with a friend. Iason attacked Theon's slave in the backyard as she was pouring a pot, before forcibly entering the house, and attacking Theon and his friend, who were both pulled down from the couch. An agent of Dioskourides was swiftly called to the scene, where he found Iason attacking Theon's friend. Theon indicates in his petition that he also sought assistance from other local authorities.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 2 is a petition submitted by Ammonius son of Nikias τῶν ὑπὸ σὲ τεταγμένων | σ[τ]ρατιωτῶν (of the soldiers assigned under your, *scil.* Dioskourides, command, l. 2-4) who was deprived of part of his ὀψώνιον καὶ σιτώνιον (rations and provisions)³⁸. Ammonius subsequently lodged a complaint with his commander, the *phrourarchos* Dioskourides, regarding the responsibility of the ὑπηρέτης (paymaster)³⁹ Ptolemaios. Ammonius requested that the arrears be paid to him.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 3 is heavily damaged. However, it appears to be a petition submitted by Dioskourides, the son of Pakemis τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ν[ικά]δα ἡρώ[ς] (from the ship of Nikadas, l. 3-4)⁴⁰. Dioskourides had a private debt with a person named Petophoias, and he requested the *phrourarchos* to arrest the debtor until he repaid the money with interest.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 4 is a correspondence from Herakleides son of Hestiodoros, the *grammateus* of the aforementioned trireme vessel of Nikadas (γραμματέως τῆς Νικάδα τριημιολίας), l. 3), to the *phrourarchos*. The letter pertains to two officials in the fleet, Antipatros and Heliodoros. It is alleged by Herakleides that Antipatros had transgressed by requesting an excess amount of remuneration for the ship's crew, a violation that had been uncovered by the competent authority in Alexandria. The *dioiketes* had ordered Antipatros to appear before him, but this summons was met with repeated evasion by Antipatros. However, both Antipatros and his successor Heliodoros had recently resurfaced. Thus, Herakleides implored the *phrourarchos* Dioskourides to detain both officials so that Dionysius, the *epistates* of the *phylakita*⁴¹, could present them to the *dioiketes* for retribution. While it is not expressed with absolute clarity that Heliodoros was indeed culpable, the fact that he was also summoned to appear before the *dioiketes* lends credence to the notion of his complicity.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 5 pertains to skin monopoly⁴², and recounts an event involving Iason and Petalos, two individuals who held the position of πραγματευόμενοι τὴν δερματηρὰν τοῦ Ἡρακλεοπολίτου (in charge of the tax on hides in the Herakleopolite *nome*, l. 4-6) during the thirty-fifth year (147/146 B.C.). These two individuals presented a certain Didymos to the *phrourarchos* Dioskourides and two of his agents, after discovering that he had attempted to smuggle nine donkey skins (εὐρόντ[ε]ς βύρσας ὄνεας | ἑννέα παρεδώκαμεν | Ἀπολλωνίωι καὶ Ἐπιμάχωι | τοῖς π[α]ρὰ σοῦ καὶ | σοὶ δὲ Δίδυμον | τὸν κεκολλητευκότα (l. κεκολλητευκότα) | αὐτά, l. 8-14). Didymos was to be detained, while the donkey skins were to be secured until a verdict was reached in his case⁴³.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 6 is the lengthiest document within the archive and comprises a copy of a petition originally addressed to the *strategos* by Artemidoros and Protarchos, the sons of Artermidoros, who were of Dorian origin. The two brothers, accompanied by others, were ambushed by a wagon driver while walking along the road from Herakleopolis to the *phrourarchia*. Upon entering the fortress gate, they were then set upon by Koson, Thymoleon, and others who were inebriated and violently attacked them using bricks, rocks, hands, feet, and even biting them. Faced with imminent danger, the siblings cried out for help, which drew a crowd to the scene. Koson and his accomplices were subsequently apprehended and taken into custody in the *phrourarchia*. Shortly thereafter, a woman named Ammonia appeared and proceeded to assault the siblings, tearing at their cloaks, and ultimately absconding with

Andronikos' cloak amidst the chaos. This was followed by the appearance of Nikodemos, Asklepiades, and numerous others who intended to murder the brothers, prompting them to seek refuge in a nearby house. The siblings suspected that the orchestrated attacks were instigated by Apollonios son of Herakleides, an Ammonian by origin, as Protarchos was bringing an adultery case⁴⁴ against his wife, whom Apollonios was reportedly involved with.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 7 details a peculiar incident involving Dioskourides, previously mentioned in document no. 3, who accused his own brother Horos of assaulting him on his way back home. In light of this accusation, Dioskourides appealed to the *phrourarchos* to summon his brother and investigate the matter at hand.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 8 = P. Münch. III 52 is a document that consists of a petition addressed to Dioskourides from Petechon ἐνπύρου τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρμου (a merchant from the Harbour, l. 3). Petechon claims to have been wronged by Stotoetis, a wine-retailer (οἰνοκάπηλος) from Herakleopolis who owed him 4 talents and 4470 bronze drachmas for a purchase of wine. Despite Petechon's repeated attempts to collect the debt, Stotoetis had been avoiding him. As a result, Petechon implored the *phrourarchos* to order the confinement of Stotoetis until he repays the debt (ἐὰν φαίνηται, | συντάξαι [ἀ]σφαλίσασθαι | αὐτὸν μέχρι τοῦ τὴν ἀπόδοσίν [μ]οι αὐτὸν ποήσασθαι, l. 14-17)⁴⁵.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 9 recounts the tale of Kleo, a woman hailing from Krokodilon Polis, who was visiting Herakleopolis (Κλεοῦς τῆς | [Ζ]ωίλου τῶν ἐκ Κορκοδίων | πόλεως τοῦ Ἀρσινοίτου νομοῦ | παρεπιδημούσης δ' ἐνταῦθα, l. 1-5) when her slave (παιδίσκη) – Thermuthis/Aphrodisia – was captured while attempting to flee (ἀποδιδράσκουσα). In response to this occurrence, Kleo sought the intervention of the *phrourarchos*, requesting that the slave be placed in the φυλακή and kept secure until Kleo's husband Peleus arrived to retrieve her.

Unfortunately, the contents of P. Phrur. Diosk. 10 cannot be ascertained, as the document has been significantly damaged. The only remaining information pertains to the intended recipient and the petitioner's name: 'Διοσκουρίδει ἡγεμόν[ι ἐπ' ἀν]δρῶν καὶ φρουράρχωι π[αρά] Τρύφωνος- - -' (to Dioskourides, leader of men (hegemon) and *phrourarchos*, from Tryphon, l. 1-3).

P. Phrur. Diosk. 11 is a very fragmentary papyrus, with only the lower part still legible. From what remains, it appears that the petitioner implored the *phrourarchos* to apprehend an individual, with the intention of both recovering his own possessions from the accused and ensuring that the latter faced appropriate punishment.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 12 stands apart from the other documents in the archive, as it is directed towards Hieron the *phrourarchos*⁴⁶. It pertains to a situation where Euphranta pledged a cloak, and the petitioner

– whose name has not survived – corresponded with the *phrourarchos*, possibly due to Euphranta's unjustifiable desire to reclaim the cloak or to forestall any future claims. Unfortunately, the precise circumstances surrounding this matter remain unclear, leaving much to conjecture.

3.2. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE *PHROURARCHOS* IN THE LIGHT OF THE ARCHIVE:

Despite the unquestionable military nature of the *phrourarchos*' functions, as evidenced by the construction of *phrourarchiai* primarily for military purposes, the archive provides limited insight into his military activities. Instead, the documents suggest that the *phrourarchos* was highly engaged in the civilian sphere.

The *phrourarchos* held the power to mediate in private conflicts that arose among his soldiers. As seen in P. Phrur. Diosk. 1, the petitioner turned to the *phrourarchos*, even though he had already petitioned the normal authorities – probably the police (ἐπιδεδωκὼς οὖν περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς εἰθιζμένοις, l. 32-33). Similarly, in P. Phrur. Diosk. 7, when a disagreement erupted between a member of the *phrourarchia* and his sibling, the petitioner sought the intervention of the *phrourarchos*, requesting that the aggressor be summoned. These instances demonstrate the *phrourarchos*' ability to serve as an arbiter in disputes among military personnel under his command.

The *phrourarchos*' involvement in private disputes was not limited to conflicts involving military personnel. The archive's documents reveal that he was frequently petitioned for assistance in disputes between civilians. This is most evident in P. Phrur. Diosk. 6, where a group of individuals – none of whom were soldiers – were embroiled in a dispute stemming from an adultery case, which had no connection to military affairs. Additionally, in P. Phrur. Diosk. 9, when a slave belonging to a woman from the Arsinoites escaped, the *phrourarchos* was called upon to detain her, even though the woman was not from Herakleopolis. P. Phrur. Diosk. 11 may have also involved a private dispute, but due to the fragmentary nature of the document, little else can be surmised. These examples suggest that the *phrourarchos* was regarded as a prominent figure in the resolution of private conflicts, regardless of whether military personnel were involved or not.

The *phrourarchos*' responsibility for the financial administration of the *phrourarchia* is evidenced by two documents. In P. Phrur. Diosk. 4, the *phrourarchos* was tasked with apprehending a defaulter *grammateus* and sending him to Alexandria. The second example can be found in P. Phrur. Diosk. 2, where a petitioner raised concerns with the *phrourarchos* about the delay in receiving his salary. It is possible that the *phrourarchos*' financial responsibilities were simply due to his superior position over all officials of the *phrourarchia*, including financial officials, as the head of the military fortress.

Nonetheless, these documents indicate that the *phourarchos* played a significant role in the financial management of the *phourarchia*.

The *phourarchos*' involvement in private financial disputes is well-documented in the archive. For instance, in P. Phrur. Diosk. 3, the petitioner requested that the *phourarchos* apprehend and imprison an individual over an outstanding debt, with the stipulation that the debtor be held until the debt was paid in full, including interest. Similarly, in P. Phrur. Diosk. 12, the *phourarchos* was called upon to mediate a conflict between two women concerning a particular pledge. These examples demonstrate the *phourarchos*' involvement in a broad range of financial disputes, both within and beyond the military context.

P. Phrur. Diosk. 5 provides evidence that the *phourarchos* had a role in regulating the royal monopolies, with a particular example concerning the skin monopoly. The document records the apprehension of a smuggler of donkey skin, who was handed over to the *phourarchos* along with the smuggled goods. This suggests that the *phourarchos* had a responsibility in controlling the royal monopolies, which were a significant source of revenue for the Ptolemaic kingdom.

The documents contained within the archive indicate that the *phourarchos* held the authority to conduct investigations, as seen in P. Phrur. Diosk. 7, and to bring individuals to trial, as evidenced in P. Phrur. Diosk. 6. These documents suggest that the *phourarchos* possessed legal powers, enabling him to play a role in the administration of justice within his jurisdiction. The archive's documents provide explicit evidence that the *phourarchia* maintained its own prison, as many of the petitions conclude with a request for the *phourarchos* to arrest and detain the accused individuals.

3.3. THE SPATIAL SCOPE OF THE *PHOURARCHOS* DIOSKOURIDES:

The precise spatial scope of the *phourarchos*' authority remains a subject of debate, as it is unclear whether his jurisdiction extended solely to matters affecting the good order within the confines of his military fortress or encompassed the broader Herakleopolite *nome*. The two siblings' petition in P. Phrur. Diosk. 6 provides evidence that the dispute occurred within or near the borders of the *phourarchia*, while other petitions within the archive were recorded by soldiers directly under the *phourarchos*' command. These factors suggest that the *phourarchos* had a level of responsibility over matters occurring within the borders of his military fortress, including disputes among civilians⁴⁷. However, in the cases of the skin smuggler⁴⁸, the escaping slave⁴⁹, the wine retailer⁵⁰, and the cloak case⁵¹, there appears to have been no direct impact on the order within the *phourarchia*. It is possible that the skin smuggler's activities took place on the borders of the Herakleopolite *nome*, and there is no

clear evidence to suggest that these incidents posed a threat to the *phrourarchia*'s overall security. As a result, it is plausible to suggest that the *phrourarchos*' sphere of action extended beyond the confines of his military fortress and encompassed the broader Herakleopolite *nome*. This interpretation is supported by the *phrourarchos*' duties and responsibilities as outlined in the archive, which suggest that he held a position of authority over matters concerning public order and security within his jurisdiction⁵².

3.4. THE DEPUTIES UNDER THE *PHROURARCHOS* AND THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE *PHROURARCHIA*:

The *phrourarchos* exercised his authority through a network of agents who, while performing police functions similar to those of the *epistatai*, *archiphylakitai*, and *phylakitai*, were not strictly policemen but rather military officers. These agents likely included soldiers and other military personnel who were stationed within the *phrourarchia* and who assisted the *phrourarchos* in maintaining order and enforcing the law within their jurisdiction⁵³. This is evidenced in the archive in the following instances: P. Phrur. Diosk. 1 (Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ παρὰ σοῦ, l. 23-24); P. Phrur. Diosk. 5 (παρεδώκαμεν | Ἀπολλωνίῳ καὶ Ἐπιμάχῳ | τοῖς π[α]ρὰ σοῦ, l. 9-11); P. Phrur. Diosk. 6 (Ἐπιμάχῳ τῷ παρὰ τοῦ φρουράρχου, l. 28).

Upon initial review, one might assume that the majority of soldiers within the *phrourarchia* were Greek, given the prevalence of Greek names in the records⁵⁴. However, it is widely understood that names during the second century B.C. did not necessarily denote ethnic or national identity⁵⁵. R. Bagnall conducted a statistical analysis on the ratio of Greek *cleruchs* to other *cleruchs* in Ptolemaic Egypt across three distinct periods: from the onset of Ptolemaic rule until 242 B.C., from 242 B.C. to 205 B.C., and from 205 B.C. to 145 B.C. Bagnall noted a rise in the proportion of Greek *cleruchs* from 23.6% to 62.6% between the first two periods, followed by a decline to 13.8% in the latter period⁵⁶. Therefore, if this trend applies to the *phrourarchia* at Herakleopolis, which operated within the broader Ptolemaic military framework, conclusions drawn solely from the frequency of Greek names of military personnel in the archive could be misleading. Greeks may not have constituted as significant a portion as initially presumed, particularly considering the decline in immigration during the second century⁵⁷, when the *phrourarchia* underwent re-establishment.

It is widely acknowledged that Jews served in the Ptolemaic army, both as *cleruchs* and as mercenary soldiers⁵⁸. Jewish communities, known as '*politeumata*'⁵⁹, existed within the Ptolemaic kingdom, with the *politeuma* of Herakleopolis being one of the largest⁶⁰. Within the archive, the name Iason, a Jewish name, appears twice⁶¹, suggesting that there were Jewish individuals present within or nearby the *phrourarchia* at Herakleopolis. Given the presence of a sizable Jewish community in the area,

it is plausible that Jewish soldiers were among those who served within the *phourarchia* at Herakleopolis.

Direct evidence for the presence of Egyptian soldiers among the troops of the *phourarchia* at Herakleopolis is lacking. In P. Phrur. Diosk. 3 and 7, we uncover semi-direct evidence of an Egyptian serving in the *phourarchia*. The petitioner, Dioskourides, bears a Greek name, yet his father's name, Pakemis, is distinctly Egyptian. Additionally, in P. Phrur. Diosk. 7, his brother is identified as Horos, another Egyptian name. This suggests that Dioskourides, likely of Egyptian origin, adopted a Greek name upon enlisting on the ship Nikadas. This aligns with Clarysse's conclusion (see note 55) that the function, rather than the origin of the bearer, determined the choice of name.

However, indirect evidence suggests that the Egyptian warriors have been present. Egyptians accompanied Ptolemy I Soter as part of his army in the battle of Gaza in 312 B.C.⁶² Furthermore, according to Polybius, Egyptians were the decisive factor in the victory of Raphia in 217 B.C. (see above). Additionally, the priests' decree of 196 B.C. (the Rosetta Stone) informs us that the king granted forgiveness to the *machimoi*, native Egyptian warriors, who participated in the revolt against the throne⁶³. After Raphia, this group (*machimoi*) flourished, and its members were granted up to ten-aroura allotments⁶⁴. It is now widely agreed that since Raphia, Egyptian warriors had become an effective element in the Ptolemaic army. Therefore, it is plausible that they may have served as soldiers in the *phourarchia* of Herakleopolis, particularly given the decline in Greek numbers within the Ptolemaic army in the second century B.C., as noted above. Furthermore, Fisher-Bovet has documented the existence of forty *phourarchiai* throughout Ptolemaic Egypt⁶⁵. After the victory at Raphia, newly recruited soldiers were extensively utilised in these *phourarchiai*⁶⁶. The archive of Peteharsemtheus son of Panechounis (TM Arch 183), from the *phourarchia* at Pathyris, sheds light on the story of an Egyptian family across five generations. The earliest known member of the family, Horos, may have been the first to enlist in the army in the late third century B.C.⁶⁷ Given that Egyptian soldiers were known to have served in the Ptolemaic army in general, and other Ptolemaic *phourarchiai* in particular, it is plausible to suggest that Egyptian warriors were also members of the *phourarchia* at Herakleopolis.

Based on the so far available evidence, we can conclude that the *phourarchia* at Herakleopolis played an essential role in the Ptolemaic military system. It was established as part of a broader effort to defend against external threats and internal rebellions, as the Ptolemies sought to maintain their control over Egypt. The *phourarchia* was manned by a diverse range of soldiers, including Greeks, Egyptians, Jews, and likely others. The duties of the *phourarchos*, with Dioskourides being the most well-known

occupant of this position during the mid-second century B.C. thanks to his archive, were both military and civil, and his authority extended over the entire Herakleopolite *nome*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Papyri, ostraca, papyrological corpora, and instrumenta are cited according to the ‘Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets’ which is available at <https://papyri.info/docs/checklist>.

And can also be checked at https://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist_papyri.html.

Inscriptions are cited according to abbreviations found in the Packard Humanities Institute project (PHI) which is available at <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/biblio#b172>.

Literary sources and works of ancient authors are cited according to abbreviations found in the Perseus Digital Library Project which is available at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Armoni, Ch. (2012). *Studien zur Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Ägypten: Das Amt des Basilikos Grammateus* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 36), Paderborn.

Austin, M. (2006). *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest, A selection of ancient sources in translation*, Cambridge.

Bagnall, R. (1976). *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden.

Bagnall, R. (1984). ‘The Origins of Ptolemaic Cleruchs’, *BASP* 21, 7–20.

Bagnall, R. and Derow, P. (2004) *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, Malden–Oxford.

Bauschatz, J. (2013). *Law and Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge.

Bingen, J. (1978). *Le Papyrus Revenue Laws: Tradition grecque et adaptation hellénistique*, Opladen.

Bingen, J. (2007, edited by Bagnall, R.). *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*, Berkeley.

Clarysse, W. (1985). ‘Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic Army and Administration’, *Aegyptus* 65, 57–66.

Clarysse, W. (1994). ‘Jews in Trikomia’, in: Bülow-Jacobsen, A. (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrology*, Copenhagen, 139–203.

Clarysse, W. (2004). ‘The Great Revolt of the Egyptians (205–186 BC)’, website of the Tebtynis Center at <http://tebtunis.berkeley.edu/lecture/revolt.html#9367>, Berkeley.

Cowey, J. 2003 ‘Zur ptolemäischen Dermaterra’, in: Cowey, J. *et al.*, *Das Archiv des Phourarchen Dioskurides (154-145 v. Chr.) (P. Phour. Diosk.)*. *Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg*, Köln–München–Wien.

Cowey, J. *et al.* (2003). *Das Archiv des Phourarchen Dioskurides (154-145 v. Chr.) (P. Phour. Diosk.)*: *Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg*, Köln München–Wien (Papyrologica Coloniensia 30), Paderborn.

- De Crom, D. (2021). 'The Letter of Aristeas', in: Salvesen, A. and Law, T. M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of The Septuagint*, Oxford, 121–134.
- Depauw, M. (2009). 'Controlling the Perfume Monopoly. A Demotic letter in Macquarie referring to a proxy in Duke', *ZPE* 171, 201–208.
- Dogaer, N. (2019). 'State Monopolies', in: Vandorpe, K. (ed.), *A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*, Hoboken, Box. 10. 1, 151–152.
- Falivene, M-R. (1998). *The Herakleopolite Nome. A Catalogue of the Toponyms, with Introduction and Commentary* (American Studies in Papyrology 37), Atalanta.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. (2014a). 'Est-il facile de conquérir l'Égypte? L'invasion d'Antiochos IV et ses conséquences', in Feyel, C. and Graslin, L. (eds.), *Le projet politique d'Antiochos IV*, Paris, 209–259.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. (2014b). *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge.
- Gorre, G. (2009). *Les Relations Du Clerge Egyptien Et Des Lagides d'Après Les Sources Privées* (Studia Hellenistica 45), Leuven.
- Heichelheim, F. (1933). 'Monopole', *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften (RE)* 16 (1), 147–199.
- Honigman, S. (2003). 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Ancient Society* 33, 61–102.
- Horne, R. (2015). *Imperial Power and Local Autonomy in Greek Garrison Communities, The Phrourarchia and the Polis*, PhD Diss., University of North Carolina.
- Jördens, A. (2010). 'Ehebruch und Sonstiges. Zum Archiv des Phrurarchen Dioskurides und anderen ptolemäischen Petitionen', in: Knuf, H. et al. (eds.), *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 194), Leuven–Paris–Walpole, 245–256.
- Kupiszewski, H. and Méléze Modrzejewski, J. (1957-1958). 'Hyperetai. Étude sur les fonctions et le rôle des hyperètes dans l'administration civile et judiciaire de l'Égypte gréco-romaine', *JJP* 11–12, 141–166.
- Lanciers, E. (2020). 'The Evolution of the Court Titles of the Ptolemaic Dioiketes in the Second Century', *Ancient Society* 50, 99–128.
- Lewis, N. (1934). *L'Industrie du Papyrus dans l'Égypte Gréco Romaine*, Paris.
- Lewis, N. (1974). *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*, Oxford.
- Lewis, N. (1986). *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt. Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.
- Maresch, K. and Cowey, J. (2001). *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3-133/2 v. Chr) (P. Polit. Jud.). Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg, Köln, München, und Wien* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 29), Wiesbaden.
- McGing, B. (1997). 'Revolt Egyptian Style: Internal Opposition to Ptolemaic Rule', *APF* 43, 273–314.
- Mokhtar, M. (1983). *Ihnâsya El-Medina (Herakleopolis Magna): Its Importance and Its Role in Pharaonic History*, Cairo.
- Monson, A. (2019). 'Taxation and Fiscal Reforms', in: Vandorpe, K. (ed.), *A Companion to Greco-Roman and Late Antique Egypt*, Hoboken, 147–162.
- Mooren, L. (1975). *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt. Introduction and Prosopography*, Brussel.
- Mooren, L. (1984). 'On the Jurisdiction of the Nome Strategoi in Ptolemaic Egypt', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia III, Napoli*, 1217–1225.

- Pestman, P. W. (1995). 'Harronophris and Chaonnophris. Two indigenous pharaohs in Ptolemaic Egypt (205–186 B.C.)', in: Vleeming, S. P. (ed.), *Hundred-gated Thebes, Acts of a colloquium on Thebes and the Theban area in the Graeco-Roman period* (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 27), Leiden, 101–137.
- Préaux, C. (1939). *L'économie royale des Lagides*, Bruxelles.
- Qandeil, H. (2024). *The Office of the Epimeletes: Studies in the Administration of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 49), Opladen.
- Qandeil, H. (forthcoming a). 'The Hypodioiketes and his Functions in the Ptolemaic Administration', in: *The Proceedings of the 30th International Congress of Papyrology*, Paris.
- Qandeil, H. (forthcoming b). 'A measuring Order of Grain for Ships' Crews', *ZPE* 230.
- Rostovtzeff, M. (1941). *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.
- Salmenkivi E. (2008). 'Herakleopolis Magna under Philadelphus', in: McKechnie P. and Guillaume P. (eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, Leiden–Boston, 183–190.
- Sandy, D. (1989). *The Production and Use of Vegetable Oils in Ptolemaic Egypt*, BASP Supp. 6, Atlanta.
- Sänger, P. (2014). 'The Politeuma in the Hellenistic World (Third to First Century B.C.): A Form of Organisation to Integrate Minorities', in: Dahlvik, J. et. al. (eds.), *Migration und Integration – wissenschaftliche Perspektiven aus Österreich. Jahrbuch 2/2013*, Göttingen, 51–68.
- Scheuble-Reiter, S. (2010). 'Loyalitätsbekundungen ptolemäischer Phourarchen im Spiegel epigraphischer Quellen', in: Coskun, A., Heinen, H., and Pfeiffer, S. (eds.), *Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt. Aspekte ihrer Repräsentation in Städten, Provinzen und Reichen = Inklusion / Exklusion. Studien zu Fremdheit und Armut von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Frankfurt am Main, 35–53.
- Strassi, S. (1997). *Le funzionidegli ὑπηρέται nell'Egitto greco e romano*, Heidelberg.
- SzántóS. (2016). *The Jews of Ptolemaic Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, PhD diss., Budapest.
- Tcherikover, V. (1957). *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum I: The Ptolemaic Period*, Cambridge.
- Veisse, A. (2004). *Les «révoltes égyptiennes»: Recherches sur les troubles intérieurs en Égypte du règne de Ptolémée III à la conquête romaine* (Studia Hellenistica 41), Leuven.
- Wilcken, U. (1899). *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien: ein Beitrag zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte I*, Leipzig–Berlin.
- Wilcken, U. (1912). *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. Erster Band. Historischer Teil. Erste Hälfte. Grundzüge, Leipzig–Berlin.
- Yiftach, U. (2003). *Marriage and Marital Arrangements: A History of the Greek Marriage Documents in Egypt, 4th Century BCE - 4th Century CE*, München.

المستخلص

دور الفرورارخيات والفرورارخيوي في مصر البطلمية: تحليل لأرشيف الفرورارخوس ديوسكورديس (١٥٤-١٤٥ ق.م)

هيثم السيد قنديل

يسعى هذا المقال إلى استكشاف الأدوار التي كانت منوطة بالفرورارخوي والحاميات العسكرية المعروفة بالفرورارخيات في مصر في العصر البطلمي، وذلك اعتماداً على أرشيف الفرورارخوس ديوسكورديس ١٥٤ - ١٤٥ ق.م. كمصدر أساسي. فعلى الرغم من الدور العسكري للفرورارخيات، إلا أن وثائق الأرشيف تظهر أنه كان للفرورارخوس مهاماً مدنية إلى جانب مهامه العسكرية.

يسعى المقال إلى الإجابة عن الأسئلة التالية: لماذا أنشئت هذه الحاميات العسكرية؟ متى أنشئت الفرورارخيا في هيراكليوبوليس ولماذا؟ ما هي الأعراف التي شكلت المكون الرئيس لجنود هذه الفرورارخيا؟ يكشف المقال عن دور الأخطار الخارجية - التي تمثلت بالأساس في العداء البطلمي السليوقي-، وكذلك الأخطار الداخلية - التي تمثلت في ثورات المصريين بعد الانتصار في موقعة رفح - في تأسيس الفرورارخيات من قبل الملوك البطالمة في بعض الأماكن ذات الأهمية الاستراتيجية في مملكتهم والتي كان إقليم هيراكليوبوليس من ضمنها. كما يكشف المقال أن اليونانيين واليهود والمصريين كانوا جنوداً في تلك الفرورارخيا وذلك اعتماداً على الأدلة المباشرة وغير المباشرة.

REFERENCES

*Lecturer in Greek and Roman History, Faculty of Arts, Ain Shams University.

¹See Horne 2015, 17f. with the corresponding notes for the terminology of fortresses in Ancient Greek world. Also, for ἄκρα, see for ex. Xen. *Anab.* 7.1.20; Luc. *Bis Acc.* 13; SEG 25:155 (Attica, 236/235 B.C.). For περιπόλιον, see for ex. Thuc. 3.99; 6. 45; 7.48; IG XII,1 1033 (Brykous, unknown).

²The scope of this paper does not include an analysis of additional evidence pertaining to the approximately forty other *phourarchiai* that were dispersed throughout the entire country.

³There is also the inscription IG I³ 1147 (Attica, 460 B.C.?), however, the date is uncertain. The term persisted in use throughout the Classical period, appearing in various epigraphic sources such as IG I³ 1032 (Attica, ca. 413? or 411? or 406? or after 408?); IG I³ 1191 (Attica, 409 B.C.); Agora XVII 23 (Attica, 409 B.C.); IG II² 1951 (Attica, beginning of the 4th cent. B.C.); SEG 41:166 (Attica, before 350 B.C.); SEG 23:125 (Attica, 4th cent. B.C.).

⁴The passage cited above is situated in the context of Herodotus' explanation of why Ethiopia was known as 'the land of deserters'. These deserters, known as 'Asmakh', are explained by Herodotus as individuals who stood on the left-hand side of the king. They consisted of two hundred and forty thousand Egyptians (?) of fighting age who had previously rebelled and allied themselves with the Ethiopians. Herodotus notes that these Egyptians had been stationed at Elephantine and Daphnae on guard duty for three years, and no one had come to relieve them. Consequently, they organised and joined forces, initiating a rebellion against Psammitic (664-610 B.C) and fled to Ethiopia. See Hdt. 2.30.1-5.

⁵Aesch. *Eum.* 949-950: ἢ τὰδ' ἀκούετε, πόλεως φρούριον, οἱ ἐπικραίνει;

⁶Thuc. 1.115: πλεύσαντες οὖν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐς Σάμον ναυσὶ τεσσαράκοντα δημοκρατίαν κατέστησαν, καὶ ὀμήρους ἔλαβον τῶν Σαμίων πενήκοντα μὲν παῖδας, ἴσους δὲ ἄνδρας, καὶ κατέθεντο ἐς Λῆμμον, καὶ **φρουρὰν** ἐγκαταλιπόντες ἀνεχώρησαν.

⁷Plat. *Laws* 6.760b-c: τὴν δὲ ἄλλην χώραν φυλάττειν πᾶσαν κατὰ τάδε. δώδεκα μὲν ἡμῖν ἡ χώρα πᾶσα εἰς δύναμιν ἴσα μόρια νενέμηται, φυλὴ δὲ μία τῷ μορίῳ ἐκάστῳ ἐπικληρωθεῖσα κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν παρεχέτω πέντε οἷον ἄγρονόμους τε καὶ **φρουράρχους**, τούτοις δ' ἔστω καταλέξασθαι τῆς αὐτῶν φυλῆς ἐκάστῳ δώδεκα τῶν πέντε ἐκ τῶν νέων, μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη γεγονότας, μὴ πλεῖον δὲ ἢ τριάκοντα. See also Plat. *Laws* 6.760d and e.

⁸Xen. *Anab.* 1.1.6: τὴν δὲ Ἑλληνικὴν δύναμιν ἤθροιζεν ὡς μάλιστα ἐδύνατο ἐπικρυπτόμενος, ὅπως ὅτι ἀπαρασκευότατον λάβοι βασιλέα. ὧδε οὖν ἐποιεῖτο τὴν συλλογὴν. ὁπόσας εἶχε φυλακὰς ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι παρήγγειλε τοῖς **φρουράρχοις** ἐκάστοις λαμβάνειν ἄνδρας Πελοποννησίους ὅτι πλείστους καὶ βελτίστους, ὡς ἐπιβουλεύοντος Τισσαφέρνους ταῖς πόλεσι. καὶ γὰρ ἦσαν αἱ Ἰωνικαὶ πόλεις Τισσαφέρνους τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκ βασιλέως δεδομένα, τότε δὲ ἀφειστήκεσαν πρὸς Κῦρον πᾶσαι πλὴν Μιλήτου.

It is noteworthy that these terms were utilised by later authors of the Hellenistic period to describe events that took place in the Classical period as for ex. Diod. 12.65.9, describing events that date back to the time of the Peloponnesian War: καὶ Θυρέας μὲν κειμένας ἐν τοῖς μεθορίοις τῆς Λακωνικῆς καὶ τῆς Ἀργείας ἐκπολιορκήσας ἐξηνδραποδίσασατο καὶ κατέσκαψε, τοὺς δ' ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας Αἰγινήτας καὶ τὸν **φρούραρχον** Τάνταλον Σπαρτιατὴν ζωγρήσας ἀπήγαγεν εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν μὲν Τάνταλον δῆσαντες ἐφύλαττον μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων αἰχμαλώτων καὶ τοὺς Αἰγινήτας.

⁹Arr. *An.* 3.5.3: **φρουράρχους** δὲ τῶν ἐταίρων ἐν Μέμφει μὲν Πανταλέοντα κατέστησε τὸν Πυδναῖον, ἐν Πηλουσίῳ δὲ Πολέμονα τὸν Μεγακλέους Πελλαῖον.

¹⁰Arr. *An.* 3.16.9: καταλιπὼν σατράπην μὲν τῆς Σουσιανῆς Ἀβουλίτην ἄνδρα Πέρσην, **φρούραρχον** δὲ ἐν τῇ ἄκρᾳ τῶν Σούσων Μάζαρον τῶν ἐταίρων καὶ στρατηγὸν Ἀρχέλαον τὸν Θεοδώρου.

¹¹For the Antigonids see for ex. Plut. *Arat.* 12.3, where a *phourarchos* was set up in Adria, one of the possessions of Antigonos Gonatas. For the Seleucids see for ex. Plb. 21.42.1.

¹²For Amyzon, see Bgnall 1976, 101f.

¹³Horne 2015, 121.

¹⁴Bagnall 1976, 108; Horne 2015, 122.

¹⁵During the First Intermediate Period (2181–2055 B.C.), Herakleopolis, now known as Ihnasya El-Medina, served as the capital of the ninth and tenth dynasties. Additionally, during the Third Intermediate Period (1069–664 B.C.), the area around Herakleopolis was strategically significant as a fortress for the rulers of the twenty-second dynasty (see Salmenkivi 2008, 183). The city's name, Herakleopolis, is derived from the Greeks identification of the Ram-God Harasphes, the Egyptian god of the city, with Herakles. During the Graeco-Roman period, Herakleopolis served as the capital of the 20th Upper Egyptian *nome* (TM Geo 801), with neighbouring *nomes* including the Arsinoites to the northwest, the Memphites to the north, the Aphroditopolites to the northeast, and the Kynopolites to the southeast on the east bank of the Nile. The Oxyrhynchites was located to the south of the *nome*. The northern border of the *nome* ran near Abu Sir al-Malaq (TM Geo 471) (Salmenkivi 2008, 183, n. 4), where the city's cemetery had been situated. For more information about Herakleopolis during the dynastic period, see Mokhtar 1983, and for the Graeco-Roman period, see Falivene 1998.

¹⁶The Ptolemies implemented a strategic policy of establishing *phourarchiai* at key locations across the country. This is vividly illustrated through epigraphic and papyrological evidence, showcasing instances of *phourarchiai* at critical sites such as Philae: IThSy 314 (187 B.C.); I. Philae 11 (175 or 145 B.C.); I. Philae I 15 (137 B.C.); I. Philae I 13=SB I 632 (131-124 B.C.); IThSy 318 (124-116 B.C.); I. Philae I 20=SB I 3448 (118 B.C.); IThSy 320 (116 B.C.); IThSy 322 (after 115 B.C.), Diospolis Magna: BGU III 992= W. Chr. 162 (186-182 B.C.); SB VI 9424=CPJ I 27 (186-182 B.C.); P. Tor. Choach. 8A and B (127 B.C.), Elephantine: IThSy 242 (152-149 B.C.); IThSy 302 (152-149 B.C.); IThSy 243 (141-131 or 124-116 B.C.), Dodekaschoinos: SB I 1918 (before 143-142 B.C.), Pathyrites: P. Grenf. I 11 (181 B.C.), and Memphis: APF 2 (1903), p. 549, no. 29 (180-145 B.C.). For more examples see Scheuble-Reiter 2010, 47–50.

¹⁷P1b.5.65.9. τὸ δὲ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων πλῆθος ἦν μὲν εἰς δισμυρίους φαλαγγίτας, ὑπετάττετο δὲ Σωσιβίῳ (The Egyptians themselves supplied twenty thousand soldiers to the phalanx and were under the command of Sosibius). Cf. also P1b.5.85.1–13.

¹⁸P1b.5.107.2. ὁ γὰρ προειρημένος βασιλεὺς καθοπλίσας τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον πόλεμον πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν ἐνδεχομένως ἐβουλεύσατο, τοῦ δὲ μέλλοντος ἡστόχησε (For in arming them for his campaign against Antiochus he had taken a step which, while it served his immediate purpose sufficiently well, proved eventually disastrous).

¹⁹P1b.5.107.3. φρονηματισθέντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περὶ Ῥαφίαν προτερήματος, οὐκέτι τὸ προσταττόμενον οἰοί τ' ἦσαν ὑπομένειν, ἀλλ' ἐζήτουν ἡγεμόνα καὶ πρόσωπον, ὡς ἱκανοὶ βοηθεῖν ὄντες αὐτοῖς. ὃ καὶ τέλος ἐποίησαν οὐ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον.

²⁰See Clarysse 2004, 1–13. During the twenty-year duration of the Great Revolt, two Egyptian pharaohs, Harronophris and Chaonnophris, were named as rulers of Upper Egypt. For additional details on these two indigenous pharaohs and the events of the revolt, see Pestman 1995, 101–137; McGing 1997, 273–314; Veise 2004.

²¹Diod. 31.15; Austin 2006, 498.

²²Diod. 31.15. For more information about the revolt of Dionysius Petosarapis, see Veise 2004, 99f.

²³Drawing a comparison between the role of the *phourarchiai* in Herakleopolis and the Acrocorinthos in mainland Greece during the mid-third century B.C., it is worth noting that Antigonos Gonatas utilised the citadel of Corinthos to disrupt connections between the north and south of Greece, which proved to be an effective strategy. However, when he lost control of the city, his control over Greece also slipped away. Given the similarity between the roles of these fortresses, it may not be an overstatement to suggest that the *phourarchiai* of Herakleopolis served as the shackles of Egypt, much like Acrocorinthos served as the shackles of Greece. See Plut. *Arat.* 16.

²⁴There is evidence for the presence of other *phourarchiai* in the Herakleopolite *nome*, as attested in P. Strasb. II 103 and P. Strasb. II 104 (Herakleopolis, both Jan. 210 B.C.). In these documents, a certain Dion, a *grammateus* of the soldiers, contacted Agathokles, the *epimeletes* of the *nome*, to issue orders for the payment of soldiers serving in the *phourion* of Techtho in the Herakleopolites (TM Geo 2288) for the month Hythor of the 12th year (=Jan. 210 B.C.); for more information about such payments, see Qandeil 2024. We have also some other few instances such as P. Med. 90.15; 90.16, 90.23 (2nd cent. B.C.); BGU VIII 1844 (50-49 B.C.). It is important to emphasise that our knowledge of other *phourarchiai* in the Herakleopolites is limited. However, we have a more comprehensive understanding

of the *phrourarchiai* in Upper Egypt; for more information about these latter *phrourarchiai* see Scheuble-Reiter, 2010, 35–53.

²⁵For the invasions of Antiochus IV on Egypt, see Fischer-Bovet 2014a, 209–259.

²⁶Fischer-Bovet 2014b, 99.

²⁷The reconstruction of the *phrourarchia* – under study in this paper – at the harbour of Herakleopolis, which occurred a few years after the invasion of Antiochus IV (see section 2.2), may indicate that the *phrourarchia* had suffered damage during the invasion.

²⁸Cowey *et al.* 2003, 2–3.

²⁹Cf. Cowey *et al.* 2003, 2–3; Fischer-Bovet 2014b, 269. It deserves mentioning that a person named Dioskourides (TM Per 34956; PP I 27; PP II+VIII 4293) appears in P. Berl. Zill. 1 (156 B.C.) who is different from our Dioskourides the *phrourarchos*. The former was a *dioiketes* (being a central or a regional *dioiketes* is problematic; for the question of regional and central *dioiketai*, see Qandeil forthcoming a) who carried first the title τῶν φίλων [UPZ I 14 (157 B.C.); P. Heid. IX 437 (161-156 B.C.); P. Gen. III 128 (163-156 B.C.)], then the title ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ (P. Berl. Zill. 1). See Mooren 1975, 136, n. 0162; Gorre 2009, 249f.; Lanciers 2020, 105–109.

³⁰Qandeil 2024, 156.

³¹P. Berl. Zill. 1, col. 3, l. 58; col. 4, l. 65; col. 5, l. 81. In Ptolemaic Egypt, aulic titles were prestigious honours bestowed upon selected high-ranking officials by the Ptolemaic king. These titles underscored the degree of proximity and allegiance the holders had to the king. Around 197-194 B.C., Ptolemy V Epiphanes introduced six such titles: ὁ συγγενής (the kinsman), τῶν πρώτων φίλων (of the first friends), ὁ ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ (the chief bodyguard), τῶν φίλων (of the friends), τῶν διαδόχων (of the successors), and τῶν σωματοφυλάκων (of the bodyguards). Later, Ptolemy VII Euergetes II added two new titles: τῶν ὁμοτίμων τοῖς συγγενέσιν (of equal honour with the kinsmen) and τῶν ἰσοτίμων τοῖς πρώτοις (of equal honour with the first friends). During the reign of his predecessor, Ptolemy VI Philometor, there was a notable change regarding the title ὁ ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ, with the plural form τῶν ἀρχισωματοφυλάκων (of the bodyguards) being used alongside the singular title; see Mooren, 1975, 1–2.

³²Mooren 1975, 108, n. 096 and 097; Mooren 1984, 1224; Cowey *et al.* 2003, 2–3.

³³P. Berl. Zill. 1, l. 4.

³⁴Cowey *et al.* 2003.

³⁵Unfortunately, the papyrus does not provide any information about Hieron's specific sphere of action. However, it appears that he was active in the Herakleopolites, given that the petitioner Artemidoros, who is described as τῶν ἀπὸ [τοῦ] ὄρμου (from the harbour area, l. 3), addresses him. This Hieron, in contrast to Dioskourides, held the court title of 'τῶν διαδόχων' (see note 31), indicating that he held a higher rank. However, due to the partial survival of the papyrus and the absence of a date, it is difficult to determine the exact period of his tenure.

³⁶As previously noted, documents P. Phrur. Diosk. 13-17 comprise letters, with P. Phrur. Diosk. 13 potentially being an official letter. Additionally, P. Phrur. Diosk. 18 is a private matter and does not provide any insight into the functions of the *phrourarchos*. Therefore, these six documents have been excluded from the summary of their content as they are not pertinent to determining the range of responsibilities held by the *phrourarchos*.

³⁷This name was commonly used among the Jews in Egypt. For more information about the name and its origin, see CPJ I, p.28, comm. 69; Clarysse 1994, 199; P. Polit. Iud. 19, p. 150, comm. 8.

³⁸The Ptolemies employed two forms of remuneration for their soldiers: professional or mercenary soldiers received a combination of cash (*opsonion* or *misthos*) and food (*sitonion*), while *cleruchs* were granted plots of land (*cleroi*) as a form of payment (Fischer-Bovet, 2014b, 118.). P. Köln XI 448 (ca. April 13 and May 12, 210 B.C.), along with P. Strasb. II 103 and 104 (both from January 210 B.C.), provide us with detailed information about the procedures and officials involved in the remuneration of soldiers during the third century B.C. UPZ I 14 (after 23 Feb.157 B.C.) and BGU XX 2840 (200 or 176 B.C., for the date see Qandeil 2024, 80, n. 2 and 188–190) are examples showing soldiers' remuneration in the second century B.C. Besides these routine payments, our documents also show irregular disbursements that required distinct handling due to their deviation from the prearranged annual payment structures. For this latter kind of payment, see Qandeil forthcoming b.

³⁹After the wages were received from the civil officials, the distribution of the wages was the responsibility of the ἀρχυπηρέτης (chief paymaster) and his ὑπηρέται (assistants of the paymaster). The ἀρχυπηρέτης was responsible for overseeing the payment process and ensuring that the soldiers received their wages in a timely and fair manner. The ὑπηρέται likely assisted the ἀρχυπηρέτης in this process, possibly by managing the distribution of wages to individual soldiers or units. For *hyperetai*, see Kupiszewski and Modrzejewski 1957/1958,141–166, Strassi 1997.

⁴⁰The ship of Nikadas is also mentioned in other documents (see P. Diosk. Phrou 4, comm. 2-3, p.37), and in all of them, it is associated with the port of Herakleopolis. Therefore, it is likely that this port was the home port of the ship.

⁴¹For this office, see Bauschatz 2013, 79f.

⁴²The topic of Ptolemaic monopolies is vast, and, to the best of my knowledge, a comprehensive study of this subject has not been published since the early 20th century. See Dogaer 2019, 151; Monson 2019, 150. The studies of the early 20th century referred to are Wilcken 1912; Heichelheim 1933, 147–199; Préaux 1939; Rostovtzeff 1941. The topic was also treated in other studies which dealt with different aspects, or one commodity only, either fully or partially monopolised, such as oil: Sandy 1989; papyrus: Lewis 1934 and Lewis 1974; incense: Depau 2009, 201–208; beer: P. Lille I 59, intr. p. 243f. See also Bingen 1978; Bingen 2007, 157–188; Armoni 2012, 139–145. Recently, a PhD project on the 'monopolies in Ptolemaic Egypt' was undertaken by Nico Dogaer at KU Leuven, but the results of this study have yet to be published.

⁴³The extent to which the trade of hides constituted a royal monopoly in Ptolemaic Egypt remains an open question and has generated considerable debate among scholars. For more information about different scholarly views on the topic, see Wilcken 1899, 294, n. 1; 354; Wilcken 1912, 250; Heichelheim 1933, col. 164-165; P. Tebt. III 1, 801, intr. p. 255; Préaux 1939, 230–233; Rostovtzeff 1941, 310; Cowey 2003 130–134; Armoni 2012, 140–142. And for the most recent discussion of the topic, see Qandeil 2024, 129–133.

⁴⁴The accusation of adultery carried severe consequences for the accused woman, as it would result in the forfeiture of her dowry. As such, Apollonios and his associates resorted to all available means to prevent the two brothers from bringing their case to court. Marriage contracts of the time commonly included clauses stipulating that the wife must not commit the crime of adultery, as doing so would result in the forfeiture of her legal rights, including her dowry. The most renowned marriage contract from

Ptolemaic Egypt, P. Eleph. 1 (311/310 B.C.), is considered the earliest discovered Ptolemaic Greek document, and states that ‘εἰάν (l. ἐάν) δέ τι κακοτεχνούσα ἀλίσκεται [[ἀλίσκεται]] ἐπὶ αἰσχύνῃ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς Ἡρακλείδου Δημητρία, στερέσθω ὧμ (l. ὦν) προσηνέγκατο πάντων’ (l. 6-7) (If she (Demetris) is caught doing anything shameful to the disgrace of her husband Herakleides, let her be deprived of all that she brought). For further insight into marriage contracts in Greco-Roman Egypt, see Yiftach 2003, and for adultery in the archive of Diskourides, see Jördens 2010, 245–256.

⁴⁵ The documents, particularly P. Phrur. Diosk. 3 and P. Phrur. Diosk. 8, provide clear evidence that in Ptolemaic Egypt, individuals could be apprehended and detained over private debts. Petitioners, such as the one in P. Phrur. Diosk. 11, also sought the intervention of the *phrourarchos*, albeit without explicitly requesting imprisonment of the debtor. A similar grievance regarding unpaid wine is documented in P. Polit. Iud. 11 (133/132 B.C.); cf. P. Phrur. Diosk. 7, intr. p. 8. It is worth noting that P. Phrur. Diosk. 8 is a reissue of P. Münch. III 52 and is included as no. 134 in Bagnall and Derow 2004, 227.

⁴⁶ See note 35 above.

⁴⁷ P. Phrur. Diosk. 1; 2; 3; 4; 7. For the dates of these documents and the following Diskourides’ documents, see *Table 1.1*.

⁴⁸ P. Phrur. Diosk. 5.

⁴⁹ P. Phrur. Diosk. 9.

⁵⁰ P. Phrur. Diosk. 8.

⁵¹ P. Phrur. Diosk. 12.

⁵² It is notable that in other instances of *phrourarchiai*, we find evidence that the *phrourarchos* engaged in duties purely civilian in nature, as indicated by his presence at land auction proceedings, as seen in BGU III 992=W. Chr. 162 (Pathyris, 186 B.C.) and BGU VI 1219, col. 3 (Hermopolites, 2nd century B.C.).

⁵³ See Bauschatz 2013, 129.

⁵⁴ P. Phrur. Diosk. 1: Herakleides (agent of the *phrourarchos*); P. Phrur. Diosk. 2: Ammonios son of Nikias (soldier); Ptolemaios (ὑπηρέτης); P. Phrur. Diosk. 3: Dioskourides son of Pakemis (soldier on the ship of Nikadas); P. Phrur. Diosk. 4: Herakleides son of Hestiodoros (*grammateus* of the ship Nikadas); Antipatros (former *grammateus* of the ship Nikadas); Heliodoros (former *grammateus* of the ship Nikadas); P. Phrur. Diosk. 5: Apollonios (agent of the *phrourarchos*); Epimachos (agent of the *phrourarchos*); P. Phrur. Diosk. 6: Epimachos (agent of the *phrourarchos*); Dioskourides son of Pakemis (soldier on the ship of Nikadas).

⁵⁵ Clarysse 1985, 57. Clarysse argued in this important article that during the second century, ‘names seem not to indicate the ethnic origin of the bearer, but rather to relate to the function an individual held in the administration or in the army’. And in p. 64 he concluded ‘when a function was felt to be Greek, its occupants had a tendency, whatever their origin, to use a Greek name and vice versa’.

⁵⁶ Bagnall 1984, 7–20

⁵⁷ See Lewis 1986, 8–35.

⁵⁸ Szántó 2016, 119. See also Tcherikover 1957, 12f.; 147–178. We have 27 instances of Jewish soldiers serving in the Ptolemaic army; see table 6 in Szántó 2016, 109. It is crucial to understand that the Letter of Aristeas’ claims – asserting that Ptolemy captured 100,000 Jewish prisoners and selected 30,000 of them for military service in fortresses – are widely recognised as exaggeration. For the Letter of Aristeas, see De Crom 2021, 121–134.

⁵⁹For the term *politeuma*, see Honigman 2003, 61–102; Sanger 2014, 51-68; Szanto 2016, 205f.

⁶⁰For the Jewish *politeuma* in Herakleopolis, see Maresch and Cowey 2001; Honigman 2003, 61–102; Kruse 2015, 271–276; Szanto 2016, 205f.

⁶¹P. Phrur. Diosk. 1, l. 7 and 5, l. 2. Iason in P. Phrur. Diosk. 5 is not a soldier but rather ‘the official in charge of the tax on hides in the Herakleopolite *nome*’.

⁶²Diod. 19.80.4. The Egyptians primarily served as auxiliary troops in this battle: συναγαγων ουν πανταχοθεν τας δυναμεις ἀνέζευξεν ἀπο Ἀλεξανδρείας εἰς Πηλούσιον, ἔχων πεζοὺς μὲν μυρίους ὀκτακισχιλίους, ἵππεις δὲ τετρακισχιλίους, ὧν ἦσαν οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες, οἱ δὲ μισθοφόροι, Αἰγυπτίων δὲ πλῆθος, τὸ μὲν κομίζον βέλη καὶ τὴν ἄλλην παρασκευήν, τὸ δὲ καθωπλισμένον καὶ πρὸς μάχην χρήσιμον (He, *scil.* Ptolemy I, therefore gathered together his forces from all sides and marched from Alexandria to Pelusium with eighteen thousand foot and four thousand horses. Of his army some were Macedonians and some were mercenaries, but a great number were Egyptians, of whom some carried the missiles and the other baggage but some were armed and serviceable for battle).

⁶³OGIS 90 (196 B.C.).

⁶⁴See Fischer-Bovet 2014b, 161f.

⁶⁵Fischer-Bovet 2014b, 270.

⁶⁶Fischer-Bovet, 2014b, 271.

⁶⁷Fischer-Bovet, 2014b, 274.