

***ARCHIPHYLAKITAI* IN PTOLEMAIC EGYPT: A HIERARCHY OF EQUALS?**

JOHN BAUSCHATZ

Abstract: Since Pieter Kool's dissertation on police in Greco-Roman Egypt, scholars have subscribed to the view that police administration was uniform across the kingdom and that police chiefs (*archiphylakitai*) in villages were connected to nome-level chiefs by a lengthy chain of command. This paper argues that neither was the case: that administrative structures varied from nome to nome, and that the hierarchy of *archiphylakitai* was flat. Chiefs answered to civil, financial, and other police officials, not to higher *archiphylakitai*. The "hierarchy" of police chiefs, unlike similar hierarchies in other spheres of government, was easily accessible, surprisingly flexible, and efficient.*

On the 9th of May, 137 B.C., the *phylakitai* of Rhodonos Nesos seized a farmer named Horion and sent him to Herakleopolis to stand trial before Komanos, the *epistatês phylakitôn*.¹ Shortly thereafter, Agathinos, Philammon, and other agents of Dionysios, *archiphylakitês*, appeared on the scene. They placed a seal on the house of a man named Ababikis, in

* An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the 2004 joint annual meeting of the American Philological Association and the Archaeological Institute of America. Much of the text has been adapted from the third chapter of my dissertation (see bibliography). I would like to thank Joshua Sosin for his comments on an early draft and the anonymous reader at *Syllecta Classica* for his or her improvements to the final version.

¹ *ZPE* 141 (2002): 185–90 (Herakleopolite, 137 B.C.), two papyri containing the correspondence of a *kômogrammateus* to a *basilikos grammateus* and others concerning wrongdoing in the Herakleopolite nome. See also the new edition of *ZPE* 141 (2002): 187–89 by C. Armoni in *P.Heid.* IX ("Anhang zu 423", pp. 41–44). Abbreviations for editions of papyri cited in this paper are after Oates, Bagnall, *et al.* 2007. Where possible, dates and provenances for papyri are those of the *Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens* (<http://www.aquila.papy.uni-heidelberg.de/gvzFM.html>).

which Horion and a certain Petesouchos (also a farmer) had been staying, and seized a number of items from the sealed home, among these two pillows and a pickled goose. After this they returned to Herakleopolis. The village scribe who composed an account of these activities charged that Agathinos, Philammon, *et al.* had acted without official sanction and even without the knowledge of their superiors in making their assault upon the farmers of Rhodonos Nesos. The royal scribe who received the village scribe's report requested that the *archiphylakitês* detain the stolen goods until the trial, make arrangements for their return, and transfer Agathinos and his co-conspirators for examination. Unfortunately, we are uninformed as to what actions were ultimately taken to resolve matters.

As this example and dozens of others like it suggest, law enforcement was a priority for the Greek rulers of Egypt.² Policing the *chôra* required the coordination of a variety of specialized officials from a number of different spheres. The most important group consisted of the *phylakitai*. These were the government agents to whom the Egyptian populace most frequently turned for help in the aftermath of criminal activity.³ They arrested, detained, and transported malefactors; investigated crimes, often visiting crime scenes and examining evidence; sealed off the homes of those under investigation; provided protection for state infrastructure and agriculture as well as private individuals; confiscated property and collected tax arrears; and worked in conjunction with a broad spectrum of other officials to ensure that justice was done.⁴

² On law enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Bauschatz; also Lesquier 260–64; Bouché-Leclercq IV 56–62; Kool; Helmis; and Thompson (1997).

³ *Phylakitai*: above all Kool and Bauschatz 27–34; also Lesquier 261–62; Bevan 163–65; Thompson (1997) 962–65; *Chrest. Wilck.* I pp. 411–16; and *P.Tebt.* I 5 p. 51 n. on 188, pp. 550–51.

⁴ Arrest, detention, and transport, *e.g.*: *BGU* VI 1248 (Syene, 137 v.c.); *P.Lille* I 3 (Magdola, after 216–215 v.c.); *P.Ryl.* IV 570 (Krokodilopolis, ca 254–251 v.c.); investigating crimes, *e.g.*: *P.Petr.* II 32 (2a) (Arsinoite, 217 v.c.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 733 (Tebtynis, 143–142 v.c.); *SB* XX 15001 (Krokodilopolis, 217 v.c.); visiting crime scenes, *e.g.*: *P.Enteux.* 65 (Magdola, 221 v.c.); *PSI* IV 393 (Philadelphia, 241 v.c.); *SB* XVIII 13160 (Moeris, 244 or 219 v.c.); examining evidence: *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59379 (?) (Philadelphia, ca 254–251 v.c.); *P.Enteux.* 70 (Magdola, 221 v.c.); *P.Petr.* III 28e (Sebennytos?, 224–218 v.c.); sealing homes (and other buildings), *e.g.*: *P.Mich.* XVIII 779 (Mouchis, after 192 v.c.); *SB* XIV 12089 (Herakleopolite, 130 v.c.); *ZPE* 141 (2002): 185–90 (Herakleopolite, 137 v.c.); protecting agriculture, *e.g.*: *BGU* VIII

ARCHIPHYLAKITAI

Duties

A number of administrators supervised the *phylakitai*. At the town and village level, *archiphylakitai*, or police chiefs, are widely attested.⁵ As agents of the central government, *archiphylakitai* processed a good deal of official paperwork, including notifications and circulars from other government officials concerning the collection, management, and security of tax revenues.⁶ They were sometimes present at state auctions of seized or forfeited goods and properties and occasionally appeared at trials and inquiries held by other officials.⁷ Police chiefs were responsible for enlisting men into their forces and likewise had the power to requi-

1851 (Herakleopolite, 64–44 v.c.); *Chrest. Wilck.* 331 (Kerkeosiris, 113 v.c.); *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59136 (Arsinoite, 256 v.c.); protecting people, *e.g.*: *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 62 (Memphis, 99 v.c.); *P.Petr.* II 1 (Arsinoite, III v.c.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 786 (?) (Oxyrhyncha, ca 138 v.c.); seizing property, *e.g.*: *P.Cair.Zen.* IV 59620 (Arsinoite, 248–239 v.c.); *P.Enteux.* 28 (Thegonis, 218 v.c.); *UPZ* I 5, 6, and 6a (Memphis, 163 v.c.); collecting tax arrears, *e.g.*: *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 53 (Kerkeosiris?, 118 v.c.); *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59407 (Philadelphia?, III v.c.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 764 (Tebtynis, 185 or 161 v.c.); working with other officials, *e.g.*: *BGU* VI 1242.5–7 (Oxyrhynchite, III–II v.c.), a circular concerning tax farming addressed ἐπιστάτη [ο]ϊκονόμοι τοπογραμματοῦσι κωμογραμματοῦσι [ἀ]ρχιφυλακίταις φυλακίταις; *PSI* IV 353 (Philadelphia, 254 v.c.), where a *phylakitês* and a *machimos* are seen on patrol in a village; *SB* XX 14708 (Theadelphia, 151 v.c.), in which *phylakitai* and *episkopoi* (or *ephodoi*? 52–53: φυλακίτα[ς] | καὶ ἐπισκόπους) are employed to track a man down.

⁵ On the Ptolemaic *archiphylakitês*, see Kool 43–66; also Engers 10, 73–85; Lesquier 261; Handrock 49–50, 118–19; and *O. Oslo* 2 p. 13. In what follows, I will use the terms “*archiphylakitês*”, “police chief”, “chief of police”, and “chief” interchangeably.

⁶ Correspondence concerning tax revenues in general, *e.g.*: *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 53.138–46 (Kerkeosiris?, 118 v.c.); *P.Gen.* III 132 (Herakleopolite?, II v.c.); *P.Lille* I 3 (Magdola, after 216–215 v.c.); beer and natron: *P.Tebt.* I 40 (Kerkeosiris, 117 v.c.); grain: *P.Tebt.* III.1 708 (Tebtynis, III v.c.); papyrus: *P.Tebt.* III.1 709 (Tebtynis, 159 v.c.); wool: *SB* XXII 15766 (Arsinoite, 223 or 181 v.c.). On the Ptolemaic papyrus monopoly see Lewis 1974 and 1989.

⁷ Present at auctions, *e.g.*: *P.Haun.* I 11 (Diospolis Magna, 182 v.c.); *P.Tebt.* III.2 871 (Krokodilopolis, 158 v.c.); *UPZ* II 219 (Thebes, 130 v.c.); at trials: *Chrest. Mitt.* 32 (Arsinoite, 181 v.c.).

sition policemen from areas outside their jurisdiction.⁸ They assigned their men to various posts, occasionally employed deputies (known as *hyparchiphylakitai*), and may even have been partially responsible for the agricultural and financial provisioning of their subordinates.⁹ Surprisingly, their rank as administrators did not grant them immunity from performing many of the functions of a modern-day police officer, among these making arrests, detaining offenders, and transporting people and property.¹⁰

⁸ As three texts suggest, there was a standard procedure to be followed by an applicant seeking admission into a corps of *phylakitai* (*P.Genova* III 101 [Arsinoite, 221 B.C.?]; 102 [Arsinoite, 221 B.C.?]; *SB XIV* 11860 Arsinoite, II–I B.C.). The applicant wrote to the *archiphylakitês* of the region in question and declared his intention to be enrolled into the ranks of the police of the village (and associated districts, if applicable) over which the *archiphylakitês* had control, in accordance with a publicly posted notice (*ektethen ekthema / programma*). He would then request that he be added (*prosgraphesthai*) to their ranks. See (e.g.) *P.Genova* III 101: Διοσκούριδει ἀρχιφ[υλακί]τ[η] Κροκοδ[ίλων] πόλεως καὶ τῶν [ca ? -σῶν] | κωμῶν παρὰ Τιμάρχου τοῦ Κροκοδ[ίλων] Σικυωνίου ἀπογράφ[ο]μαι [εἰς τοὺς] | περὶ Κροκοδ[ίλων] πόλιν κατὰ τὸ ἐκτε[θ]έν ἔκθεμα [εἰς τοὺς] φυλακίτας | ἀξιῶ οὖν προ[σ]γραφῆναι μέ[τε]ρ | L α Παχῶν κη. Requisitioning: see *SB VI* 9104 (Arsinoite, 195 B.C.), a letter in which an official requests that another official bring one of the *phylakitai* in the *katalochismos* over to Krokodilopolis to serve (*leitourgeîn*) in the quarters (*oikêsis*) of the *archiphylakitês* for thirty days. On this text see Bauschatz 31.

⁹ Assigning men to posts, e.g.: *Chrest. Wilck.* 331.iii.68–69 (Kerkeosiris, 113 B.C.), where *archiphylakitai* are to ensure that the *phylakitai* appointed for the annual guarding of grain (*genêmatophylakia*) perform their duties correctly; *P.Hib.* II 198.117–20 (Arsinoite, after 242 B.C.), a list of royal ordinances concerning police in which *archiphylakitai* are instructed to provide armed escorts (*phylakai*) for river travelers; *P.Mich.* XVIII 778 (Mouchis, after 193–192 B.C.), a petition from a victim of extortion who requests that the *dioikêtês* either arrange a trial for him or instruct the *archiphylakitês* to send word to the village *phylakitai* to arrest an offender; *hyparchiphylakitai*: these officials might appear at government auctions (*BGU* III 1222.61, 75 [Hermopolite, 144 B.C.]) and could possess *klêroi* (*P.Tebt.* III.2 1006.6–7 [Tebtynis, II B.C.]), but their duties and the reasons for and nature of their appointments are unclear; provisioning: *P.Petr.* III 130 (?) (Arsinoite, III B.C.), a curious document containing a list of expenses for copper miners (*chalkôrychioî*) and the transport of castor oil as well as part of a letter from an *archiphylakitês* (who also held the post of *epistatês phylakitôn*) to some men involved in crown-sponsored hunting (16–17: [ca ?] ἡπιππος θηροφύλαξι).

¹⁰ Arresting and detaining, e.g.: *Chrest. Wilck.* 166 (Arsinoite, 218 B.C.); *P.Athen.* 8 (Arsinoite, 193–192 B.C.); *P.Heid.* VII 393 (Arsinoite or Memphite, III B.C.); transporting, e.g.: *P.Enteux.* 24 (Magdola, 221 B.C.); 50 (Magdola, 221 B.C.); *P.Lond.* VII 2188 (Hermonthis, 148 B.C.).

Though on the one hand government agents with many administrative duties, Ptolemaic *archiphylakitai* were also intimately connected to their local populations. They received petitions, generally concerned with theft, damage to person or property, or both from injured parties.¹¹ The petitions draw attention to the punitive powers of these officials. *Archiphylakitai* were expected to arrest accused parties, carry out investigations of reported crimes, and generally see to it that justice was done on the petitioner's behalf. In one typical case a priest wrote to an *archiphylakitês* and his *phylakitai* and detailed a series of abuses followed by a theft (*P.Tebt.* III.1 797 [Berenikis Thesmophorou, II B.C.]). The victim described an attack (involving beatings on his shin and face), listed the stolen goods, asked that the *archiphylakitês* have the offenders sent to another official for punishment, and requested the return of his missing property.¹² Though empowered to tend to most routine police matters on their own, *archiphylakitai* also on occasion worked in conjunction with a number of other government officials to maintain law and order throughout the countryside.¹³ Victims of crime in Ptolemaic Egypt had a number of options when it came to reporting grievances. The documents show that *archiphylakitai* were the most common and

¹¹ Petitions to *archiphylakitai*, e.g.: *P.Giss. Univ.* I 7 (Euhemeria, II B.C.); *P.Tebt.* I 41 (Kerkeosiris, 105–90 B.C.); *SB VIII* 9674 (Euhemeria, ca 131 B.C.). For the content of petitions to *archiphylakitai* and other Ptolemaic police officials see Bauschatz 69–72; on petitions to Ptolemaic officials in general, Hombert/Préaux; di Bitonto Kasser 1967, 1968, and 1976; Parca; and *P.Heid.* VII 394 p. 48 and the additional sources cited there.

¹² For more on the responses of *archiphylakitai* and other police officials to the written requests of villagers see Bauschatz 78–79 and 90–97.

¹³ Government circulars, often sent to police, civil, military, and financial officials, provide the best evidence for the cooperation of *archiphylakitai* and other government agents, e.g.: *P.Lille* I 3 (Magdola, after 216–215 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* I 40 (Kerkeosiris, 117 B.C.); III.1 708 (Tebtynis, III B.C.). See also (e.g.) *Chrest. Wilck.* 331 (Kerkeosiris, 113 B.C.), a letter to an agent of the *basilikos grammateus* who is reprimanded for his bungled selection of subordinates (among these *phylakitai*, *dekanoi phylakitôn*, and *archiphylakitai*) to help run the *genêmatophylakia*; *P.Heid.* VI 362 (Herakleopolite, 226 B.C.), a letter from an *oikonomos* to the *archiphylakitai* and *phylakitai* of the Herakleopolite nome instructing them to prevent people from removing beehives and cows from the nome; and *P.Petr.* II 1 (Arsinoite, III B.C.), a petition to an *epimelêtês* from a man who requests that the recipient write to an *archiphylakitês* to provide protection for him.

convenient point of access to the law enforcement pyramid for those living in the Egyptian backwater.¹⁴

Distribution

In his dissertation on the organization and function of the *phylakitai* Pieter Kool argued that the pattern of Ptolemaic police organization was always the same: that a regular structure applied throughout the Egyptian countryside (101). Other scholars have expressed the same view, though discussions of the organization of the *phylakitai* have been few and brief.¹⁵ But the papyrological evidence makes it quite clear that the geographical domains of *archiphylakitai* were varied and that the pattern of local organization was not always the same. In fact, the distribution of police chiefs throughout the Egyptian countryside displayed a good deal of variation and a decided lack of uniformity. A brief consideration of the evidence for the distribution of *archiphylakitai* will bear out these assertions.

Let us begin with the highest geographic level for which police competence is attested: the nome. Certainty regarding the number of nomes into which Egypt was divided at any given point in the Ptolemaic period is perhaps impossible. During the Pharaonic period, Egypt was divided into forty-two nomes (twenty-two in Upper Egypt, twenty in Lower Egypt), and by the third century A.D. the number had grown to near sixty (*OCD3*, s.v. “*nomos* (1)”). Strikingly, *archiphylakitai* of the Arsinoite, Herakleopolite, Memphite, and Pathyrite nomes are the only ones attested throughout the entire three hundred-year reign of the Ptolemies.¹⁶ The evidence for these nome-level officials demonstrates

¹⁴ For a brief discussion of alternatives to the petitioning process in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Bauschatz 72–75.

¹⁵ See, for instance, Lesquier 261–62; Bouché–Leclercq 58–59; and Bevan 163–65.

¹⁶ In assessing this statement the reader should keep in mind that documentary evidence from Graeco-Roman Egypt has survived in a very uneven state. For the Ptolemaic period, Arsinoite and Herakleopolite papyri are especially well-represented: Arsinoite texts predominate in the third and second centuries B.C., Herakleopolite texts in the first. Papyri from the other nomes are significantly rarer. In addition, virtually nothing has survived from the Delta region, which includes Alexandria, the administrative and cultural center of the Ptolemaic state. For a more detailed discussion of the chronological and geographic variations in the papyrus evidence from the third century B.C. to

only that they carried out the same tasks as lower-level chiefs. For instance, Herakleides, an *archiphylakitês* of the Herakleopolite nome, is seen making an arrest (*Chrest. Wilck.* 166.i.10–11 [Arsinoite, 218 B.C.]); Pleistarchos, a Pathyrite *archiphylakitês*, transports litigants to trial (*P.Lond.* VII 2188.91–92 [Hermonthis, 148 B.C.]). Neither appears to have had any special administrative powers connected to his high title or any obligation to supervise lower-level *archiphylakitai*. Each simply served a broader geographic region than the chief of a village (*kômê*) or district (*topos*).¹⁷

Certain nomes had geographic subdivisions between nome and village. Evidently, the Ptolemies saw fit to install police supervision at these levels, as *archiphylakitai* of a few Herakleopolite, Oxyrhynchite, and Pathyrite toparchies and certain Arsinoite *merides* occur in the papyri. The number of attestations for these officials is slightly higher than that for police chiefs of nome-level competence.¹⁸ Here again, there is no

the eighth century A.D. see Habermann's survey. Arsinoite *archiphylakitai*: Herakleides, *P.Bürgsch.* 23.4, 4–5, 15–16, 17–18 (Ghoran, 243 B.C.); [—]igenes (*Pros. Ptol.* 4542), *P.LilleDem.* I 4.int.3, ext.6 (Ghoran, 247 B.C.); Herakleopolite: Herakleides (*Pros. Ptol.* 4577 with add.), *Chrest. Wilck.* 166.ii.10 (Arsinoite, 218 B.C.); office of the Herakleopolite *archiphylakitês* mentioned at *P.Gen.* III 132.4 (Herakleopolite?, II B.C.); Memphite: office mentioned at *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 62.3 (Memphis, 99 B.C.); Pathyrite: Herakleides (*Pros. Ptol.* 4578), *P.Dryton* 33.14 (? , 136 B.C.); Pleistarchos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4595 with add.), *P.Lond.* VII 2188.91–92 (Hermonthis, 148 B.C.).

¹⁷ Of the other nome-level *archiphylakitai* mentioned in the preceding note, none is recorded as performing any special tasks. One Herakleides (*P.Bürgsch.* 23) arranged for a man to be imprisoned; another (*Pros. Ptol.* 4578) received a petition from a number of women concerning an inheritance. [—]igenes received an application for bail. *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 62 and *P.Gen.* III 132 are circulars addressed to a number of nome-level officials and their subordinates, the first requesting protection for an embalmer, the second concerning the appointment of a tax collector.

¹⁸ Kato toparchy (Oxyrhynchite): Patron (*Pros. Ptol.* 4592 with add. = 4711 with add.), (*e.g.*) *P.Hib.* I 73.9–10 (Oxyrhynchite, 244–243 B.C.); Theodoros (*Pros. Ptol.* 4581), *P.Frankf.* I 3.26–27 (Tholthis, 212 B.C.); Koite toparchy (Herakleopolite): Phillipos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4602a with add.), *P.Hib.* II 203.14–15 (? , 246–221 B.C.); Peri Thebas toparchy (Pathyrite): Di[] (*Pros. Ptol.* 2205 with add. = 4567 = [?] 4566 with add.), *UPZ* II 187.1–3 (Thebes, 127–126 B.C.); Polemon *meris*: Dionysios, *P.Coll.Youtie* I 16.9–10 (Arsinoite, 109 B.C.); Philon (*Pros. Ptol.* 4604 with add.), *e.g.*: *ZPE* 152 (2005): 191.6–7 (Arsinoite, 196–195 B.C.); Ptolemaios (*Pros. Ptol.* 4598), *P.Tebt.* III.1 731.4 (Tebtynis/Ibion Eikosipentarouron, 153–152 or 142–141 B.C.); Themistes *meris*: Philoxenos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4603), *P.Bürgsch.* 22.2–3, 13–14

indication that *archiphylakitai* of toparchies and *merides* held positions of greater importance in the Ptolemaic criminal justice system than their counterparts in the towns and villages of the Egyptian countryside. Theodoros, *archiphylakitês* of the Kato toparchy (of the Oxyrhynchite nome), for example, inspected a window broken in the course of a robbery (*P.Frankf.* I 3 [Tholthis, 212 B.C.]); Philoxenos, *archiphylakitês* of the Themistes *meris*, received applications for bail (*P.Bürgsch.* 22 [Ghoran, 243 B.C.] and *P.LilleDem.* I 4 [Ghoran, 247 B.C.]). Similarly, there is also no proof that *archiphylakitai* of *merides* or toparchies were subservient to nome *archiphylakitai*.

There is evidence, however, that many of these mid-range police chiefs may have considered themselves above the law. At least three seem to have been brought up on criminal charges: Patron, *archiphylakitês* of the Kato toparchy (of the Oxyrhynchite nome), was accused of disobeying official orders (*P.Hib.* I 34 [Oxyrhynchite, 243 B.C.] and 73 [Oxyrhynchite, 244–243 B.C.]); Philippos, *archiphylakitês* of the Koite toparchy (of the Herakleopolite nome), was charged with illegal arrest (*P.Hib.* II 203 [?, 246–221 B.C.]); and Philon, *archiphylakitês* of the Polemon *meris*, was accused of tax evasion (*ZPE* 152 [2005]: 191 [Arsinoite, 196–195 B.C.?]).¹⁹ That ancient police broke the law themselves should not be surprising to us: modern police departments furnish many points for comparison.²⁰ What is unusual, though, is that evidence for corruption at the nome level is lacking. This, however, may simply be a

(Ghoran, 243 B.C.) and *P.LilleDem.* I 4 interior 2, exterior 5–6 (Ghoran, 247 B.C.). See also Diokles (*Pros. Ptol.* 4563), *P.Tebt.* III.2 871.5–6 (Krokodilopolis, 158 B.C.); Διοκλέους Ζηνοδώρο[v] τῶν | κατὰ μερίδα ἀρχιφυλακίτων, and the same man at 1071.6 (Tebtynis, 158 B.C.); also *SBXXII* 15766.3 (Arsinoite, 223 or 181 B.C.?): τοῖς κατὰ μερίδα ἀρχιφυλακίταις).

¹⁹ On Patron, see *Pros. Ptol.* 4592 with add. and 4711 with add. He appears in no fewer than 13 texts: *P.Hib.* I 34 (Oxyrhynchite, 243 B.C.); 73 (Oxyrhynchite, 244–243 B.C.); II 236 (Oxyrhynchite, ca 250–240 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 744 and 745 (Tebtynis, 245 B.C.); 746 and 747 (Tebtynis, 243 B.C.); 748, 749, and III.2 937 (Tebtynis, ca 243 B.C.); 938 (Tebtynis, 243 B.C.); 939 (Tebtynis, 242 B.C.); and *P.Yale* I 35 (Oxyrhynchite, 249 B.C.). He may also be mentioned in *P.Tebt.* III.1 794 (Tebtynis, before 210 B.C.). On Philon, see *Pros. Ptol.* 4604 with add. and *ZPE* 152 (2005): 190. Philippos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4602a with add.) occurs only in this text (*P.Hib.* II 203 [?, 246–221 B.C.]).

²⁰ On police corruption in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Bauschatz 177–210; on corruption in Ptolemaic Egypt in general, Crawford and Peremans.

function of chance and not an indication that men of the highest moral purity filled the top levels of police administration.

The greatest number of attestations for *archiphylakitai* are for those officials with village-level jobs: no fewer than twenty-seven named Egyptian towns and villages spread throughout the countryside, and countless anonymous ones, had *archiphylakitai* in the Ptolemaic period.²¹ This is not at all surprising. The Ptolemies filled the towns and villages of their empire with various types of government officials. The titles these officials bore reveal the narrowness of their jurisdictions. For example, a *kômogrammateus* was the scribe (*grammateus*) of a village (*kômê*) and a *toparchês* was the governor (*-archês*) of a region (*topos*). The *archiphylakitês* of a village was one of a number of officials (among these the *kômarchês*, *kômogrammateus*, and *epistatês*) who had jurisdiction in that area and

²¹ The following villages are known to have had *archiphylakitai* in the Ptolemaic period. The nine marked with a (?) are uncertain cases and have not been included in the total of twenty-seven cited above: Alabanthi (*P.Enteux.* 24.7 [Magdola, 221 B.C.]); Aphrodite Berenike (?) (*P.Tebt.* III.2 902.2–4 [Arsinoite, II B.C.]); Arsinoe (e.g.: *SBXVI* 12813.2–3 [Arsinoite, II B.C.?]); Berenikis (Aigialou) (*SB* III 7203.6 [Arsinoite, 247 B.C.]); Berenikis Thesmophorou (e.g.: *P.Tebt.* III.1 797.1–2 [Berenikis Thesmophorou, II B.C.]); Diospolis Magna (?) (*P.Tör.Choach.* 11.36–37 [Thebais, 119 B.C.]); Euhemeria (e.g.: *P.Giss.Univ.* I 7.1–2 [Euhemeria, II B.C.]); Hermoupolis Magna (?) (*SB* VIII 9792.14–15, 19–21 [Hermoupolis Magna, 162 B.C.]); Kerkeosiris (e.g.: *P.Heid.* II 217.1–3 [Kerkeosiris?, II B.C.]); Kirka (?) (*P.Dion.* 10.1 [Hermopolite, 109 B.C.]); Koma (*BGU* VIII 1808.7 [Herakleopolite, after 52–51 B.C.]); Krokodilopolis (e.g.: *P.Cair.Zen.* V 59819.8–9 [Krokodilopolis?, 254 B.C.]); Moithymis (e.g.: *P.Heid.* VII 394.1–3 [Moithymis, 214 B.C.]); Onnes (*BGU* VIII 1808.11 [Herakleopolite, after 52–51 B.C.]); Oxyrhyncha (e.g.: *P.Erasm.* I 1.18–19 [Oxyrhyncha, 148–147 B.C.]); Pathyris (e.g.: *P.Grenf.* II 37.1 [Pathyris, 108 B.C.]); Petachor (*BGU* VIII 1808.19 [Herakleopolite, after 52–51 B.C.]); Philadelphia (e.g.: *BGU* III 1012.4–5 [Philadelphia, 170 B.C.]); Philai (?) (*P.Stras.* II 101.9–10 [?, I B.C.]); Philoteris (*P.Enteux.* 50.4–5 [Magdola, 221 B.C.]); Phnebieus (e.g.: *BGU* VIII 1798.1 [Herakleopolite, 64–44 B.C.]); Pisais (e.g.: *P.Bürgsch.* 23.2–3, 13–15 [Ghoran, 243 B.C.]); Pois (*P.Tebt.* III.2 857.1–2 [Herakleopolite, 162 B.C.]); Rhodonos Nesos (?) (e.g.: *ZPE* 141 [2002]: 186.3–7 [Herakleopolite, 137 B.C.]); Sebennytyos (*P.Petr.* III 28e.13–14 [Sebennytyos?, 224–218 B.C.]); Soknopaiou Nesos (*P.Mich.* XV 688.1–2 [Soknopaiou Nesos, II–I B.C.]); Syene (*P.Siut.* 10591 verso ii.9–10, iii.11–12 [Syene, 170 B.C.]); Syron Kome (*P.Cair.Zen.* III 59404.7–8 [Philadelphia?, III B.C.]); Tachenephre (?) (*UPZ* I 124.19–20 [Memphis, 175 B.C.?; 165 B.C.?]); Talei (*P.Tebt.* III.1 709.2–3 [Tebtynis, 159 B.C.]); Tanis (P.Petrie ined. [201 B.C.; see *Pros. Ptol.* 4608b]); Tebtynis (*SB* XII 11078.5 [Arsinoite, ca 100 B.C.]); Tekmi (e.g.: *BGU* VIII 1808.2 [Herakleopolite, after 52–51 B.C.]); Theadelphia (?) (*SEG* XXXIII 1359.3–4 [Theadelphia?, 107–101 B.C.]); Tinteris (?) (*P.Heid.* IX 422.14–16 [Tinteris, 158 B.C.]); Trikomia (*P.Enteux.* 82.5 [Trikomia, 221 B.C.]).

worked together to keep the peace. However, unlike other local officials, chiefs of police at the village level could have very specific sub-designations unparalleled elsewhere in Ptolemaic bureaucracy. We see chiefs of multiple villages, as well as chiefs of those living around villages, chiefs of villages and the associated or neighboring areas, and chiefs of these areas (or *topoi*) alone.²² This high degree of geographic specification suggests a desire to provide broad access to the criminal justice system at all levels of habitation. Such organization ensured police protection not only to the inhabitants of Egyptian towns and villages, but also to those living in sparsely settled outlying areas. In such places there might well have been greater need for an *archiphylakitês* and his subordinates to protect against wrongdoing. The papyri are filled with references to travelers waylaid by brigands. In many cases, victims appealed for help to the *phylakitai* and their supervisors.²³

Geographic specification in circumscription was not limited to police chiefs working in the boondocks, however. Temples, too, had *archiphylakitai*. The temple of Anubis in Memphis provides the best

example of this phenomenon.²⁴ The Anoubieion was a decidedly strange place. It was a large complex that served multiple purposes and in which a number of people lived and worked. It required a degree of organization and supervision unnecessary elsewhere and, as such, was outfitted with a police station, officers, and an *archiphylakitês*.²⁵ Other evidence suggests that *archiphylakitai* may have been stationed in more traditional temples, as well, though the data are admittedly hard to interpret. A police force patrolled the temple of Aphrodite in Memphis as well as a temple of Isis in the Oxyrhynchite nome.²⁶ Supervision for these officials would have been necessary, and an *archiphylakitês* may have been the man responsible. It is also possible that an *archiphylakitês* supervised the temple of Serapis in Hermoupolis Magna, though it is perhaps more likely that the official with jurisdiction over the Serapieion was actually the police chief of Hermoupolis itself.²⁷

²⁴ On the Anoubieion and its residents see Thompson (1988) 212–65; Lewis (2001) 69–87; and *UPZ I* pp. 7–95.

²⁵ *Archiphylakitês* of the Anoubieion: Herioubastis (*Pros. Ptol.* 4571), e.g.: *P.Bürgsch.* 16 verso 1 (Memphis, 159 B.C.); Barkaios/Ammonios (?), *UPZ I* 64.1 (Memphis, 156 B.C.; see *UPZ I* pp. 316–19); post mentioned at *UPZ I* 5.6 and 6.6 (Memphis, 163 B.C.). The Anoubieion also had an *epistatês*: on this official and the other administrators of the Memphite Sarapieion see *UPZ I* pp. 44–45. The *epistatês* of the Anoubieion (as well as the *epistatês* of each of the other temples in the Serapieion complex) seems to have had a decidedly police function and should not be confused with the *epistatês hierou* attested elsewhere (e.g.: *BGU VI* 1214.7–8 [Arsinoite, ca. 185–165 B.C.]; *P.Paramone* 7.8–9 [Antaioupolis, II B.C.?]; *P.Ryl.* IV 572.44 [Arsinoite?, II B.C.]) who seems to have been connected with the financial administration of the temple(s) under his authority.

²⁶ Memphite Aphrodision: *UPZ I* 119.21 (Memphis, 156 B.C.): [φυλ]ακίτας ἐκ τοῦ ἐμ. [Μέ]μφει Ἀφροδισίου; an Isieion in the Oxyrhynchite nome: *PHib.* I 167 (no line numbers given; Oxyrhynchite, ca. 245 B.C.): Ἀρμύσιος τοῦ ἀπὸ [τ]οῦ Ἰσιείου φυ(λακίτου). On Harmiusis, see *Pros. Ptol.* 4649.

²⁷ *Archiphylakitês* of Hermopolite Serapieion (or of Hermoupolis Magna) (?): Dannos, *SB VIII* 9792.14–15 (Hermoupolis Magna, 162 B.C.): Δάννωι (sc. ἀρχιφυλακίτη ?) | καὶ τοῖς κωμοφυλακίταις. Dannos may have been an *archiphylakitês*, though since he appears only here and without title, one cannot be certain. In fact, one cannot even be certain that Hermoupolis Magna had a police chief. One additional text suggests that chiefs operated in the city, but does not prove that one was stationed there: *BGU VI* 1222.61 (Hermopolite, 144 B.C.), Bettides (*Pros. Ptol.* 4558); and 74–75, Anaxagoras (*Pros. Ptol.* 4548). Neither Bettides nor Anaxagoras is given a circumscription.

²² Multiple villages: Dioskourides: *P.Genova* III 95 verso 1 (Arsinoite, 216 B.C.?); 101.1–3 (Arsinoite, 221 B.C.?); 102.1–3 (Arsinoite, 221 B.C.?); Διοσκουρίδει ἀρχιφυλακίτηι Κροκοδίων πόλεως καὶ τῶν κατὰ τῶν κωμῶν; 121.1–2 (Arsinoite, III B.C.); perimeters of villages: Stratonikos, *SB XIV* 11860.1–3 (Arsinoite, II–I B.C.): Στρατονίκωι | ἀρχι[φ]υλακίτηι τῶν | περὶ Ἀρσινόην κατὰ τῶν κωμῶν; a village and *topoi*: Aristomachos (?), *SB XVI* 12528.3 (?), III–II B.C.): [κατὰ τῶν μεμερισμένων τόπων] (see Thomas and Clarysse 404 note on 3–4 for the identification of this *archiphylakitês*); Dioskourides (*Pros. Ptol.* 4565), *P.Tebt.* III.1 795.1–3 (Tebtynis, II B.C.): Διο[σ]κου[ρί]δει ἀρχιφυλακίτηι Κροκοδίων πόλεως | καὶ τῶν μεμερισμένων τόπων; just *topoi*: Aristoboulos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4554 with add.), *SB VI* 9108.17–18 (Aphroditopolite, 173–169 B.C.): Ἀριστο[β]ο[ύ]λωι | τῶν τῶν τόπων ἀρχιφυλακίτηι; Dionysodoros (*Pros. Ptol.* 4564 with add.), *SB I* 4309.3–4 (Arsinoite, III B.C.): τοῦ Διονυσ[ο]δώρου [τοῦ ἀρχι]φυλακτεύσαντος τῶν ἐξ τῶν τόπων.

²³ E.g.: *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59224 (Arsinoite, 253 B.C.), a petition from a man who had been attacked by a robber (*léistês*) while traveling to Philadelphia and had pointed out the offender to an *archiphylakitês*; *P.Mil.* II 30 (Lykopolis, II B.C.), a fragmentary official letter concerning highway robbery (*lôpodysia*), specifically the theft of a himation, and the response (?) of the *phylakitai*; *SB VIII* 9792 (Hermoupolis Magna, 162 B.C.), a petition from a man who had been attacked by a band of thieves (*léistêrion*) while away from home and robbed of two donkeys, his clothing, and other goods. He had subsequently made an official report of the incident to the village *phylakitai*. For more on bandits and brigandage in Graeco-Roman Egypt see McGing.

HIERARCHY?

The documents make it clear that *archiphylakitai* were found in a variety of locations. As we have seen, chiefs of police at lower levels were not obviously subordinate to those with more elevated posts. Yet this was generally not the case with other government positions that were arranged geographically. Government scribes, for example, were arranged in a strict succession of rank. Village and district scribes (*kômo-* and *topogrammateis*, respectively) were subordinate to those of royal rank (the *basilikoi grammateis*).²⁸ That the scribal hierarchy was meaningful is illuminated by a second-century letter from a *basilikos grammateus* (*P.Tebt.* I 10 [Ptolemais Euergetis?, 119 B.C.]). In this document, the *basilikos grammateus* (Asklepiades, 1) writes to a *topogrammateus* (Marres, 1 and 9) requesting that the latter official supply “the papers of his office” (τὰ τῆς χρείας γράμματα, 6) to a newly appointed *kômogrammateus* (the well-known Menches) and see to it that the *kômogrammateus* fulfill the obligations of his office.²⁹ The chain of command is clear: the *basilikos grammateus* provided instruction to the various *topogrammateis*, who in turn were responsible for instructing the *kômogrammateis* below them. Yet surprisingly, the evidence seems to indicate that the Ptolemaic hierarchy of *archiphylakitai* was a hierarchy of equals: that is, that the various lower-level chiefs did not form a ranked succession of officials. There is no evidence that lower-ranking *archiphylakitai* within a given nome ever reported to higher-ranking ones. In fact, not a single piece of correspondence between Ptolemaic police chiefs survives. This is especially striking, given the great amount of correspondence that has survived from other areas of Ptolemaic administration (the scribal hierarchy, for instance).³⁰ It suggests that *archiphylakitai* within the nome operated

²⁸ On the hierarchy of Ptolemaic *grammateis*, see Oates (1995); Kruse 1997 and 2002 11–22; and Verhoogt 70–105.

²⁹ On this letter and the three scribes it concerns, see Verhoogt 60 with notes 42 and 43.

³⁰ Archives provide our best window on Ptolemaic officials and their circles of correspondence. See Verhoogt for detailed information on the archive of Menches, *kômogrammateus* of Kerkeosiris in the late second century B.C.; *P.Diosk.* for the archive of Dioskourides, *phourarchos* of Herakleopolis, which covers the years 154–145 B.C.; *P.Enteux.* for a collection of documents addressed to and concerning *epistatatai* and *stratêgoi*; and Pestman for a guide to the best known archive from the Ptolemaic period,

entirely independently of one another. The Ptolemies seem to have installed *archiphylakitai* at numerous geographic levels so as to provide easy public access to the police system at a variety of points and to ensure protection for the inhabitants of even the remotest settlements. They do not appear to have intended to establish a system of checks and balances between *archiphylakitai* in different positions. Higher-level police chiefs may have been superior in terms of titular prestige, but there is no solid proof that chiefs of nomes, toparchies, and *merides* had more important responsibilities, garnered better wages, or commanded a broader range of subordinates than those in towns, villages, and districts.

Nor is there any evidence that lower-level *archiphylakitai* could gain promotion to higher-level posts. To be sure, the documents demonstrate that *archiphylakitai* might hold other positions in the Ptolemaic administration after (or even concurrent with) their tenure as chiefs. For instance, a man named Aniketos was *archiphylakitês* and *epistatês* of Euhemeria; a Theodotos was *archiphylakitês* and *oikonomos*; and a certain Heliodoros filled the posts of *archiphylakitês*, *epistatês*, and *kômogrammateus* (though not necessarily all at the same time), probably in Theadelphia.³¹ The reasons behind these dual (and even triple) appointments are unclear, but it seems probable that many *archiphylakitai* who held additional posts were enabled to do so because they worked in less densely-popu-

the correspondence of Zenon (manager of the great estate of the *dioikêtês*, Apollonios, at Philadelphia), which covers the years 261–229/8 B.C.

³¹ *Archiphylakitai* holding other posts: *archiphylakitês* and *epistatês*: Aniketos (*Pros. Ptol.* 643 with add. = 4550 with add.), Euhemeria, e.g.: *P.Giss.Univ.* I 7.1–2 (Euhemeria, II B.C.); Apollonios (?), Oxyrhyncha, e.g.: *ZPE* 146 (2004): 168.1–3 (Oxyrhyncha, 154–153 or 143–142 B.C.) with p. 167; Demetrios (*Pros. Ptol.* 660 with add. = 4561 with add.), Kerkeosiris, e.g.: *P.Tebt.* I 43.9–10 (Alexandria, 117 B.C.); Demetrios, Soknopaiou Nesos: *P.Mich.* XV 688.1–2 (Soknopaiou Nesos, II–I B.C.); Herakleides (*Pros. Ptol.* 669 = 4579), Tebtynis (?): *P.Tebt.* I 230 (no line numbers given; Kerkeosiris?, II B.C.); Sisinnios (*Pros. Ptol.* 714 = 4599 with add.), Syene: *P.Siut* 10591 verso ii.9–10 (Syene, 170 B.C.); *archiphylakitês*, *epistatês*, and *kômogrammateus*: Heliodoros, Theadelphia (?): *SEG XXXIII* 1359.3–4 (Theadelphia?, 107–101 B.C.); *archiphylakitês* and *epistatês phylakitôn*: Nikon (*Pros. Ptol.* 4536 = 4590); *P.Petr.* III 130.16 (Arsinoite, III B.C.); *archiphylakitês* and *oikonomos*: Theodotos (*Pros. Ptol.* 1049 with add. = 4580 with add.); *Chrest. Wilck.* 331.29 (Kerkeosiris, 113 B.C.). In *UPZ* II 187.1–3 (Thebes, 127–126 B.C.), we see an *archiphylakitês* with the status designations *tôn philôn* and *hipparchês ep' andrôn* (Di[], *Pros. Ptol.* 2205 with add. = 4567, who is perhaps to be identified with the Diophantos, *archiphylakitês*, mentioned in *UPZ* II 219.15 [Thebes, 130 B.C.]; on the latter official see *Pros. Ptol.* 4566 with add.).

lated areas of the *chôra* and thus had fewer demands on their time than chiefs of more populous regions.³² But though they might occasionally assume additional government posts in their vicinity, men serving as *archiphylakitai* seem never to have changed their geographical domains or to have attained a higher-ranking police position within a given area. That is, there are no cases where, for example, the chief of police of one village turns up later as chief of another.³³ Similarly, there are no cases of a village *archiphylakitês* eventually attaining the position of police chief of the *meris*, toparchy, or nome in which his village was located.³⁴ Though a man might have expected a fairly long career as a chief of police, he evidently would not have expected opportunities for horizontal or vertical movement within the ranks of the *archiphylakitai*.³⁵

³² Indeed, of all the *archiphylakitai* who held multiple appointments during their careers (cited in the previous note), only one worked in a city (*polis*), not a village (*kômê*): Sisinnios, *archiphylakitês* and *epistatês* of Syene.

³³ In a handful of cases *archiphylakitai* with the same given name are found in different locations but at the same administrative level within a twenty-five-year period. For example, a Herakleides was *archiphylakitês* of the Arsinoite nome in 243 B.C. (*P.Bürgsch.* 23.4, 4–5, 15–16, 17–18 [Ghoran]) while another was *archiphylakitês* of the Herakleopolite in 218 B.C. (*Chrest. Wilck.* 166.ii.10 [Arsinoite]). Unfortunately, the prosopographical data for this case (and others like it) does not prove that one man held both posts.

³⁴ There are no instances in which *archiphylakitai* with the same first name are found at different levels of police administration within a given nome and within a twenty-five-year period. Thus, if vertical movement among *archiphylakitai* took place, it may have entailed a switch of nomes. For example, a man named Dionysios appears to have been *archiphylakitês* of Rhodonos Nesos (a Herakleopolite village) in 137 B.C. (*ZPE* 141 [2002]: 185–90 with *P.Heid.* IX, “Anhang zu 423”, pp41–44 [Herakleopolite]) and another Dionysios was *archiphylakitês* of the Polemon *meris* (of the Arsinoite nome) by 109 (?) B.C. (*P.Coll. Youtie* I 16.9–10 [Arsinoite]). Yet aside from the name they share there is no firm proof that these two men were actually one and the same.

³⁵ Careers for *archiphylakitai* could be fairly long. At least a few men held their posts for more than five years. Dikaios, *archiphylakitês* of Moithymis (*Pros. Ptol.* 4562 with add.), may have been chief of police for six years or more: compare *P.Heid.* VII 394 (214 B.C.) and *P.Köln* V 216 (209 B.C.). This may also have been the case with Dioskourides, *archiphylakitês* of Krokodilopolis κ[αὶ τῶν κα ?]σῶν κομῶν (*P.Genova* III 102.2–3): *P.Genova* III 102 (221 B.C.?) and 95 (216 B.C.?). Patron, *archiphylakitês* of the Kato toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome (*Pros. Ptol.* 4592 with add. = 4711 with add.), may have been in office more than eight years: *P.Yale* I 35 (249 B.C.) and *P.Tebt.* III.2 939 (242 B.C.). Philon, *archiphylakitês* of the Polemon *meris* (*Pros. Ptol.*

Yet though room for advancement may have been limited, in other respects the organization of *archiphylakitai* was quite flexible. Petitioners seem to have been aware of this. Police chiefs were the most common recipients of appeals for justice in Egyptian villages, but it does not seem to have been the case that appeals necessarily began with chiefs at the town or village level. For example, in a second-century petition, a group of sisters living in the village of Pathyris noted that they had previously submitted a petition to the *archiphylakitês* of the Pathyrite nome (*P.Dryton* 33 [?, 136 B.C.]). Yet in doing so, they bypassed the *archiphylakitês* of the village of Pathyris, ostensibly the first level of appeal for troubled townsmen.³⁶ Similarly, a pair of bail agreements in Egyptian Demotic illustrates that someone attempting to post bail for a prisoner did not necessarily have to contact the *archiphylakitês* of the locale in which the offender was being detained (*P.Bürgsch.* 22 and 23 [Ghoran, 243 B.C.]). In both applications (each of which concerns a separate case) bail was arranged for a prisoner in the village of Pisais in the Themistes *meris* of the Arsinoite nome. Yet while one of the documents was addressed to the *archiphylakitês* of Pisais (*P.Bürgsch.* 23), the other was sent to the *archiphylakitês* of the Themistes *meris* (*P.Bürgsch.* 22).³⁷ Such seemingly misdirected appeals suggest that villagers exploited the elasticity of the police system to receive the best possible outcome for their complaints. Not limited to appealing to strictly local officials, victims of crime in Ptolemaic Egypt might very well direct their petitions to government agents with broader geographical competencies in the hopes of ensuring a faster and perhaps more satisfactory resolution to their complaints.³⁸

4604 with add.; also *ZPE* 152 [2005]: 190), may have served for more than twelve years: *ZPE* 152 (2005): 189–93 (196–195 B.C.?) and *P.Tebt.* III.1 796.1 (185 B.C.). Finally, Apollonios, *archiphylakitês* and *epistatês* of Oxyrhyncha, may have held one or both posts for anywhere between seventeen and twenty-five years. On his career see *ZPE* 146 (2004): 167.

³⁶ *Archiphylakitês* of Pathyris: [—] *npjlus* (*Pros. Ptol.* 4608a), or his son, [—] (*Pros. Ptol.* 4608c), *P.Gebelen* 28.5–6 (Pathyris, ca 140 B.C.); office mentioned at *P.Grenf.* II 37.1 (Pathyris, 108 B.C.).

³⁷ The *archiphylakitês* in *P.Bürgsch.* 23.3, 14–15 is Artemidoros (*Pros. Ptol.* 4557). In *P.Bürgsch.* 22.2–3, 13–14 the *archiphylakitês* is Philoxenos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4603).

³⁸ They also might appeal to more than one official at the same time, e.g.: *P.Heid.* IX 433 (Herakleopolite, 161–155 B.C.), a petition in which the writer noted that he had

SUPERIORS

Epistatai

We have seen that the hierarchy of Ptolemaic police chiefs was flat. To whom did *archiphylakitai* turn for instruction? The evidence demonstrates that chiefs of police at all levels of administration within the nome regularly reported not to another chief or military officer, but rather to a civil official appointed by the central government. In the small settlements of the Egyptian countryside, *epistatai* were the officials to whom *archiphylakitai* most commonly turned for instruction.³⁹ *Epistatai* had many duties in the realm of policing, a number of which were similar to those of the *archiphylakitês* and *phylakitai*. They visited crime scenes, inspected evidence, sealed homes, interrogated witnesses and suspects, made arrests, transported alleged criminals for trials, and prevented harassment.⁴⁰ They received notifications from government officials and petitions from villagers, were present at government auctions, issued receipts for the payment of taxes, and assisted in the collection of tax

previously written to the *kômogrammateus*, the village *archiphylakitês*, and an *epimelêtês* concerning the wrongdoing discussed in his petition; *P.Hib.* I 34 (Oxyrhynchite, 243 B.C.) and 73 (Oxyrhynchite, 244–243 B.C.), two reports on the misbehavior of an *archiphylakitês*, the former addressed to the king, the latter to the village *epistatês*; *UPZ* I 5, 6, and 6a (Memphis, 163 B.C.), three petitions concerning an illegal search, the first addressed to the *stratêgos*, the second to the sovereigns, and the third to an unknown official. For more on petitions to police in the Ptolemaic period see note 11, above. On the Ptolemaic *epimelêtês*, see below.

³⁹ On *epistatai* see Lavigne; also Van 't Dack (1949) 39–44, (1951) 20–23 and 46–47, and 1989; and Wolff 171–76. The third-century documents published as *P.Entreux* provide a good survey of the variety of duties, both police and civil, that an *epistatês* was required to perform; see the introduction.

⁴⁰ Inspecting crime scenes/evidence: *P.Münch.* III.1 55 (Herakleopolite, II B.C.); *P.Stras.* II 100 (? , II B.C.); sealing homes: *SB* I 4309 (Arsinoite, III B.C.); interrogations, e.g.: *P.Heid.* VIII 416 (Herakleopolis, II B.C.); *P.Tor.Amen.* 7 (Thebes, 119–117 B.C.); *SB* III 7177 (Herakleopolite, 243 B.C.); arresting and transporting criminals, e.g.: *BGU* VI 1244 (Herakleopolite, 225 B.C.); *Chrest.Mitt.* 12 (Arsinoite, 244–222 B.C.); *P.Bingen* 44 (? , I B.C.); preventing harassment, e.g.: *P.Dion.* 11 (Hermopolite, 108 B.C.); *P.Entreux.* 87 (Alabanthi, 222 B.C.); *P.Mil.Congr.XVII* pg21/22 (Arsinoite, after 142–141 B.C.).

arrears.⁴¹ But they also performed a number of additional functions that *archiphylakitai* did not, among these delivering summonses to Ptolemaic courts, expelling squatters, and sitting on advisory councils with other government officials.⁴² Perhaps the most important of their duties was the administration of trials and examinations in Egyptian towns and villages. Dozens of documents reveal that *epistatai* meted out justice at the behest of both petitioners and higher government officials.⁴³

Epistatai in Egyptian villages, towns, and districts also commonly handed out instructions to *archiphylakitai* at the same level. A third-century letter to an *epistatês* concerning the premature release of a donkey thief by an *archiphylakitês* and his failure to return the donkey to its owner makes it clear that the orders of the *epistatês* were binding on the *archiphylakitês* (*P.Hib.* I 73 [Oxyrhynchite, 244–243 B.C.]).⁴⁴ The writer lays the blame for the failed transaction squarely upon the shoulders of the chief and notes that he had disobeyed direct orders (*prostagmata*) from the *epistatês*. Another third-century document suggests that an *archiphylakitês* might occasionally be prevented from taking action unless he had first received written permission from the *epistatês* (*SB* X 10272 [Magdola, III B.C.]). In this text, an *archiphylakitês* seeks a letter from an *epistatês* authorizing him to inspect a house.⁴⁵ As both of these

⁴¹ Notifications, e.g.: *BGU* VI 1214 (Arsinoite, ca 185–165 B.C.); *P.Grenf.* II 37 (Pachynis, 108 B.C.); *P.Rain.Cent.* 45 (? , 197–190 B.C.); petitions, e.g.: *BGU* VI 1251 (Philadelphia, 155 or 144 B.C.); *P.Erasm.* I 4 (Oxyrhyncha, II B.C.); *P.Köln* III 140 (Arsinoite, 244–242 or 219–217 B.C.); present at auctions: *UPZ* II 219 and 221 (Thebes, 130 B.C.); issued receipts: *O.Bodl.* I 111 (Thebes?, 140 B.C.); collected tax arrears, e.g.: *Chrest.Wilck.* 55 (Psenyris, III B.C.); *P.Berl.Dem.* I 15522 (Elephantine, III–I B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 746 (Tebtynis, 243 B.C.).

⁴² Delivering summonses, e.g.: *P.Entreux.* 43 (Magdola, 221 B.C.); 51 (Magdola, after 222 B.C.); *P.Hib.* II 203 (? , 246–221 B.C.); expelling squatters: *BGU* III 1006 (? , III B.C.); *P.Entreux.* 10 (Magdola, 221 B.C.); 14 (Magdola, 222 B.C.); advisory councils: *P.Ryl.* IV 572 (Arsinoite?, II B.C.).

⁴³ E.g.: *P.Mert.* I 5 (Ptolemais, 149–137 B.C.); *P.Mich.* III 173 (Philadelphia, 169 B.C.); *P.Tor.Choach.* 11bis (Thebes, 119 B.C.).

⁴⁴ See also *P.Hib.* I 34 (Oxyrhynchite, 243 B.C.) on this same incident. The *archiphylakitês* in question is Patron, *archiphylakitês* of the Kato toparchy of the Oxyrhynchite nome (see above, note 19).

⁴⁵ The writer of this letter, a certain Pasis, is not given a title in the document; but it is likely that he is to be identified with Pasis, *archiphylakitês* of Alabanthi (*Pros. Ptol.* 4591).

documents demonstrate, the chief of police in a given area answered to the local *epistatês* and received his instructions from that official. Had he also been responsible to a higher-ranking chief, there would have been potential for conflict between the *epistatês* (the head man on the scene) and the commanding *archiphylakitês* (who would not necessarily have been a local or fully informed of local events). By establishing a hierarchy of equals among *archiphylakitai*, the Ptolemies not only ensured fast access to law enforcement for the inhabitants of the *chôra*, but also simplified the official chain of command.

Stratêgoi

Epistatai gave orders to *archiphylakitai* and received their own orders from the *de facto* governors of the nomes, the *stratêgoi*.⁴⁶ Though it is clear that *epistatai* had close connections to the *stratêgos*, the *archiphylakitês* seems never to have received instructions from him. Even in those cases where petitioners or other officials sought out the assistance of the *stratêgos* in reprimanding or instructing an *archiphylakitês*, the *stratêgos* always contacted the *epistatês* in charge of the region in question. Three third-century petitions addressed to the king and queen make this quite clear (*P.Entreux*. 24, 50 [Magdola, 221 B.C.], and 82 [Trikomia, 221 B.C.]).⁴⁷ In each case, a petitioner requested that the *stratêgos* contact the *archiphylakitês* of his (that is, the petitioner's) town or village to perform the same duty: transfer an accused for trial. But in none of these cases did the *stratêgos* write to the *archiphylakitês*; instead, he invariably wrote to the *epistatês* of the village in question.⁴⁸ The reasons for this are perhaps

⁴⁶ On the Ptolemaic *stratêgos* see above all Bengtson III and Hohlwein; also Mooren and Van 't Dack (1948). *P.Entreux*. reveals that the *stratêgos* was the judicial official of primary importance in the third century for criminal cases; see also Wolff 162–63. (For judges in civil cases, see Wolff 48–53 [*laokritai*] and 64–89 [*chrêmatistai*].) As *P.Entreux*. demonstrates, *stratêgoi* had direct contact (via official correspondence, at least) with the various civil *epistatai*.

⁴⁷ It should be noted that though formally addressed to the sovereigns, petitions of this sort were actually delivered by the petitioner to the office of the *stratêgos*: *P.Entreux*. ppxi–xl.

⁴⁸ A fourth petition addressed to the sovereigns and requesting that the *stratêgos* have an *archiphylakitês* transfer an accused for trial survives but its subscription is almost entirely lost (*P.Entreux*. 77 [Magdola, 221 B.C.]).

not difficult to fathom. *Archiphylakitai* were primarily officials of town or village competence who supervised the activities of the *phylakitai* and were generally given ample freedom to attend to matters of law and order in their communities. It is unclear precisely how or by whom *archiphylakitai* were recruited, but the surviving evidence suggests that hiring was done in Egyptian villages.⁴⁹ Thus, nome-level officials such as the *stratêgos* may not have been personally familiar with *archiphylakitai* in the *chôra*.

Such officials were clearly familiar with *epistatai*, however. In fact, *stratêgoi* were at least occasionally responsible for hiring *epistatai*, to judge from one text, a petition to the *stratêgos* from a number of crown cultivators (*P. Tebt*. III.1 788 [Oxyrhyncha, 143 B.C.]). In their petition, the writers recall the former's appointment of trustworthy *epistatai* to whom instructions had been given by the sovereigns to prevent extortion. As this document demonstrates, the *epistatês* served as a representative of nome-level government at the village level. He was an intermediary between the local population and the central government but was also responsible for supervising law enforcement in his locality, including *archiphylakitai*. For the most part, however, it was only through the town or village police chief that the *epistatês* had a connection to the *phylakitai*. The *epistatês* does not appear to have taken much initiative in the realm of law enforcement. He generally acted only when called upon from above (through orders from the *stratêgos*) or below (via petitions from villagers), and often simply delegated to the local *archiphylakitês* and his men. When he did act, however, the *epistatês* might perform many of the same tasks of the *archiphylakitês* below him.

Epistatai Phylakitôn

Epistatai were the geographically closest, but not the only officials who supervised police chiefs. At the nome level, *epistatai phylakitôn*, the police commissioners of the Ptolemaic empire, were responsible for tying up

⁴⁹ See *Chrest. Wilck.* 331 (Kerkeosiris, 113 B.C.), a copy of a letter from the *dioikêtês* to Hermias, *ho epi tôn prosodôn*, concerning delinquencies in his work for the annual guarding of crops (*genêmatophylakia*). The document reveals that the latter official was (at least occasionally) responsible for appointing men to the position of *archiphylakitês* as well as that of *oikonomos* (21–22) and that the men to fill these posts may have come from the nearby vicinity (45–53). For further discussion of this text see Bauschatz 149–52.

administrative loose ends left dangling by *archiphylakitai*.⁵⁰ The documents reveal that *epistatai phylakitôn* had a number of functions similar to those of *archiphylakitai*. They were present at auctions and in courts, collected and protected tax revenues, received petitions and circulars, transported offenders, and investigated crimes.⁵¹ A second-century petition addressed to an *epistatês phylakitôn* makes it clear that this official was an appropriate appeals court for issues that had not received satisfactory resolution at the hands of the local police (*SB VIII 9792* [Hermoupolis Magna, 162 B.C.]). The petitioner noted that he had filed an initial complaint of theft with the local *phylakitai*. Remediating action was taken, but the case was not cracked. Consequently, the petitioner appealed to the *epistatês phylakitôn* in the hopes that the involvement of the higher authority might speed the wheels of justice.⁵² In another second-century petition a priest requested that a village *archiphylakitês* send some men who had perpetrated an assault to the *epistatês phylakitôn* (*P.Tebt.* III.1 797 [Berenikis Thesmophorou, II B.C.]). The petitioner seems to have understood that higher-level police chiefs in the nome (in this case *archiphylakitai* of the Polemon *meris* or the Arsinoite nome itself) were

⁵⁰ On the *epistatês phylakitôn* see above all Kool 67–85; also Berneker 78–79; Van ‘t Dack (1949) 40–44; and di Bitonto Kasser (1985) 3–5; on the relationship between the *epistatês phylakitôn* and the *archiphylakitês*, Kool 100–04; *Chrest. Wilck.* I pp411–12; *P.Hib.* I 34 p. 175 n. on 1; and *P.Tebt.* I 5 pp. 46–47 n. on 159.

⁵¹ At auctions: *P.Ryl.* II 253 (Hermoupolis Magna, 142 B.C.); in courts, e.g.: *BGU VI 1252* (Arsinoite, II B.C.); *P.Ryl.* II 68 (Hermoupolis Magna, 89 B.C.); *SB VIII 9792* (Hermoupolis Magna, 162 B.C.); collecting/ protecting revenue, e.g.: *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 53.138–46 (Kerkeosiris, 118 B.C.); *P.Köln VII 313A.1–6, 25–27* (Oxyrhynchus?, 186 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.1 793.iv.1–6 (Berenikis Thesmophorou, 183 B.C.); petitions to: *P.Ryl.* II 68 (Hermoupolis Magna, 89 B.C.); *SB VIII 9792* (Hermoupolis Magna, 162 B.C.); circulars to, e.g.: *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 62 (Memphis, 99 B.C.); *P.Gen.* III 132 (Herakleopolite?, II B.C.); *SB XXII 15766* (Arsinoite, 223 or 181 B.C.); transporting offenders: *P.Diosk.* 4 (Herakleopolite, 153 B.C.); *ZPE 141* (2002): 187–89 (?) (Herakleopolite, 137 B.C.; see *P.Heid.* IX, “Anhang zu 423”, p. 44 n. on 20–21); investigating crimes, e.g.: *P.Heid.* IX 423.18–22 (Tebetny, 158 B.C.); 425 (Herakleopolis, 158 B.C.); *P.Tebt.* III.2 857 (Herakleopolite, 162 B.C.).

⁵² An *epistatês phylakitôn* might also redirect a petition sent to him. In one instance a petitioner wrote to the *oikonomos* to request that an offender be transported, presumably for examination (*BGU VI 1244* [Herakleopolite, 225 B.C.]). The *oikonomos* forwarded the petition to the *epistatês phylakitôn*, who then forwarded the document again, this time to the village *epistatês*, with instructions for the apprehension and transport of the accused.

not the natural points of contact for the village chief.⁵³ He also may have realized that even an *archiphylakitês* with a geographical competency broader than the bounds of his village would not guarantee the same level of satisfaction as a nome-level agent of the central government.

The petition mentioned above suggests that an *archiphylakitês* might contact an *epistatês phylakitôn*, or at least arrange for news or detainees to reach him. Our information on the relationship between these two officials is unfortunately quite limited, in spite of the fact that we know quite a bit about the government agents with whom the *epistatês phylakitôn* might associate. He crossed paths with officials from a number of different areas. Correspondence between *epistatai phylakitôn* and *basilikoi grammateis*, *epistatai*, *oikonomoi*, *stratêgoi*, and *thêrophylakes* survives.⁵⁴ We have examples of officials sending men to the *epistatês phylakitôn*, as well as the *epistatês phylakitôn* being sent to other officials.⁵⁵ We also have examples of the *epistatês phylakitôn* sitting in council, performing investigations, and serving on a panel of judges with other

⁵³ *Archiphylakitês* of the Polemon *meris*: see above, note 18; of the Arsinoite nome: note 16.

⁵⁴ The archive of the *basilikos grammateus* Dionysios (*P.Heid.* IX) contains a number of documents forwarded by Dionysios (or one of his subordinates) to the *epistatês phylakitôn* with instructions for action: 423 (Tebetny, 158 B.C.); 425 (Herakleopolis, 158 B.C.); 426 (?) (Herakleopolis, 158 B.C.); 430 (?) (Herakleopolis, 161–155 B.C.); and 434 (?) (Herakleopolite, 161–155 B.C.). It also may contain a petition to the *basilikos grammateus* in which the writer requests that the recipient write to the *epistatês phylakitôn* to carry out an investigation: 432 (Herakleopolite, 161–155 B.C.). In addition, in *ZPE 141* (2002): 188 verso 20 (Herakleopolite, 137 B.C.), a *basilikos grammateus* begins a draft of a letter to an *epistatês phylakitôn*. *BGU VI 1244* (Herakleopolite, 225 B.C.) consists of a petition originally sent to the *oikonomos* who forwarded it to the *epistatês phylakitôn*, who in turn forwarded it to an *epistatês*. In another petition (*BGU VIII 1854* [Herakleopolite, 74–73 or 45–44 B.C.]), the writer requests that the recipient, a *stratêgos*, contact the *epistatês phylakitôn*. Finally, *P.Petr.* III 130.16–17 (Arsinoite, III B.C.) preserves the beginning of a letter from an *epistatês phylakitôn* (who was also an *archiphylakitês*) to a number of officials lost in lacuna (?) as well as the [—] *ippo*i and *thêrophylakes*.

⁵⁵ In *P.Diosk.* 4 (Herakleopolite, 153 B.C.), a scribe informs the *phourarchos* Dioskourides that the *epistatês phylakitôn* is on his way to take custody of a pair of men who will then be sent to the *dioikêtês*. In *P.Tebt.* III.1 793.iv.1–6 (Berenikis Thesmophorou, 183 B.C.), petitioners ask an *epistatês* that he write to an official with the title *ho pros tēi syntaxei* so that the latter will send the *epistatês phylakitôn* to be present for the measurement of some grain (?).

officials.⁵⁶ Yet only two documents shed any real light on the official relationship between the *archiphylakitês* and the *epistatês phylakitôn*. The first of these, a petition to an *archiphylakitês* in which the chief is asked to send some offenders to the *epistatês phylakitôn* (*P.Tebt.* III.1 797, mentioned above), makes it clear that an *archiphylakitês* might transport people to an *epistatês phylakitôn*, or at least that a petitioner might assume that a chief could perform this task. The second text seems to suggest that an *archiphylakitês* might serve as an agent of an *epistatês phylakitôn* (*P.Hamb.* II 172 [Oxyrhynchite, 246 B.C.]). This document, an official letter, preserves an order from a man named Apollodotos to a man named Nikanor instructing Nikanor to pay Apollodotos' agent Theophiles a certain amount of money to cover the back-wages of some *archiphylakitai*. Based on the circumstances, the editors of *Pros. Ptol.* VIII suggested that Apollodotos (*Pros. Ptol.* 4524a) was an *epistatês phylakitôn* and that Theophiles (*Pros. Ptol.* 4543a) was an *archiphylakitês*. These identifications are far from certain, however; and, in addition, we find references in other texts to agents of the *epistatês phylakitôn*, but in no case is a subordinate given a police title.⁵⁷ It seems premature, therefore, to conclude that there was a close relationship between *archiphylakitai* and *epistatai phylakitôn*, and ultimately it must remain uncertain whether *epistatai phylakitôn* ever contacted the police chiefs in their nomes.

⁵⁶ In council: *P.Ryl.* IV 572.39–42 (Arsinoite?, II B.C.), where a *stratêgos* is advised to consult with the *epistatês*, *epistatês phylakitôn*, *oikonomos*, and the *basilikos grammateus* about men suitable for drawing up some Demotic contracts (*synallagmata Aigyptia*, 9); *UPZ I* 110.140–55 (Memphis?, 164 B.C.), a decree from the *dioikêtês* in which the recipients are advised to sit in council with the *stratêgoi*, *epistatai phylakitôn*, *oikonomoi*, and *basilikoi grammateis*, as well as with the representatives of the *grammateus* of the *machimoi*, and with the *topogrammateis*, *kômogrammateis*, and others; investigating: *P.Tebt.* III.2 857.10–19 (Herakleopolite, 162 B.C.), where the *basilikos grammateus*, an agent of the *epimelêtês*, and the *epistatês phylakitôn* look into a grain robbery; in court: *P.Tebt.* 43.19–21 (Alexandria, 117 B.C.), where the *epistatês phylakitôn* and the *basilikos grammateus* held an *episkepsis* on a charge of poisoning.

⁵⁷ Agents of the *epistatês phylakitôn*: Asklepiades (*Pros. Ptol.* 4543 with add.), *P.Tebt.* I 43.5–6 (Alexandria, 117 B.C.): Ἀσκληπιάδην τινὰ τῶν παρ' Ἀμυν[ίου] | τοῦ ἐπιστάτου τῶν φυλακῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ; 179 (no line numbers given; Tebtynis, II B.C.): τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ ἐπιστάτου τῶν φυ(λακῶν) ὅτε ἤλθοσαν χάρι(ν) τῶν προβά(των); Ptolemaios (*Pros. Ptol.* 1451 with add. = 4544), III.2 890.37 (Herakleopolite, II B.C.): Πτολεμαῖω ἀπὸ πό(λεως) χει(ριστή) ἐπ(ιστάτου) φυ(λακῶν).

Financial Officials

Oikonomoi

We have seen that chiefs were in close contact with the civil *epistatai* in the towns and villages of the Egyptian *chôra* and received many of their orders from these officials, and also that chiefs sometimes answered to the *epistatês phylakitôn*, a nome-level representative of the *phylakitai*. Yet police chiefs did not receive instruction from these two officers exclusively. From time to time, officials charged with economic oversight gave orders to *archiphylakitai*. The papyri reveal that *oikonomoi* occasionally gave instructions to *archiphylakitai* and other police officials in their administrative districts to attend to financial and agricultural malfeasance.⁵⁸ In one case the Herakleopolite *oikonomos* forwarded instructions concerning the prevention of smuggling of beehives and cows to the *archiphylakitai* and *phylakitai* of the Herakleopolite nome (*P.Heid.* VI 362 [Herakleopolite, 226 B.C.]).⁵⁹ The *oikonomos* asked that the recipients of the notification not allow any of the beekeepers to remove hives from the nome without his authorization. The second half of the circular is fragmentary, but it is likely that the *oikonomos* made a similar request of the *archiphylakitai* and *phylakitai* with regard to a number of cowherds. Those caught rustling cattle may have been arrested, transported under guard (*meta phylakês*) to Herakleopolis, and tried.⁶⁰ The *oikonomos* did not have police powers, but he did have the authority to co-opt *archiphylakitai* and their subordinates to enforce laws that bore directly on his own sphere of competence, the economy.

Sometimes the relationship between the *oikonomos* and the *archiphylakitês* was more complicated. In one instance an official in charge of the export of grain reported that the *archiphylakitês* of the Herak-

⁵⁸ On the Ptolemaic *oikonomos* see Berneker 94–102.

⁵⁹ On Herakleides, the *oikonomos* (without title) in this document, see *Pros. Ptol.* 1047 and *P.Heid.* VI p. 9 n. on 2.

⁶⁰ 34–41, from the text of a letter sent originally to the *oikonomos* and forwarded to *archiphylakitai* and *phylakitai*: προσδιασαφήσας δ' αὐτοῖς ἐά[ν τινες] | τῶν τοπογραμμάτων παραδεκν[ύωσί] | τινας [ἐξάγ]οντ[ας μ]όσχους .θουντ[ας ca ?] | παρα[ca 11 φ]υλακ[. . .]s διὰ τῆ[ς ἐντο]λῆς [. . .] καὶ σφ[ραγισα]μένους μείζονα[ς τῶν] | γαλα[θ]ηρῶν [. . .]εν. . .ατα καθισ[τάνα]ι | εἰς Ἡ[ρ]ακλέους πόλιν μετὰ φυλακῆ[ς ca ?] | . . . αὐτοὺς διατηρεῖν.

leopolite nome had arrested some Arsinoite shipbuilders (*Chrest. Wilck.* 166 [Arsinoite, 218 B.C.]). The chief had also ignored the commands of the Arsinoite *oikonomos* to release them, insisting that he would only answer to the *epimelêtês* or *dioikêtês*.⁶¹ Was this simple negligence or was the *archiphylakitês* insisting on a point of jurisdiction? Could an Arsinoite official give orders to one from the Herakleopolite? Another text, containing an order to arrest from the Arsinoite *oikonomos* addressed to a Memphite *archiphylakitês*, seems to suggest that he could (*P.Heid.* VII 393 [Arsinoite/Memphite, III B.C.]).⁶² In this case, however, the fact that the two officials were from different nomes was not necessarily a barrier to the chain of command.⁶³ Unfortunately, we are uninformed as to what action (if any) the police chief took in response to the *oikonomos*' strict order to arrest a bath attendant.⁶⁴ Consequently the question of the administrative domain of the *oikonomos* must remain open.

The issue of hierarchy between the *oikonomos* and the *archiphylakitês* has received some scholarly consideration and consensus seems to have been reached. The editors of *P.Tebt.* I suggested that in the third century the *oikonomos* was the most important financial official in the nome, but that by some point in the second he had become less so as the *epimelêtês* and the *stratêgos* gained greater fiscal responsibility (*P.Tebt.* I 5 pp. 46–47 n. on 159). Such a weakening in the position of the *oikonomos* is suggested by the documents. As we have already seen, three third-century texts demonstrate that *oikonomoi* might give orders to *archiphylakitai*.⁶⁵

⁶¹ The Ptolemaic *epimelêtês* was an upper-level official who had authority in certain areas of financial administration. Berneker 90–94 remains the authority for this post. On the *dioikêtês*, one of the chief civil and financial officials in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Berneker 80–89 and Thomas.

⁶² Neither the *oikonomos*, Zephyros, nor the *archiphylakitês*, Dikaios, is given a title in the document. For the identification of Zephyros see *Pros. Ptol.* 1041a and *P.Heid.* VII pp42–44; for Dikaios, *Pros. Ptol.* 4562 with add.

⁶³ Moithymis was apparently part of an area (including regions of the Aphroditopolite, Arsinoite, Herakleopolite, and Memphite nomes) in which inter-nome official overlap sometimes occurred: *P.Heid.* VII pp45–46 n. on 1.

⁶⁴ 4–7: κατὰσθησον | ἐφ' ἡμᾶς· καὶ μὴ ἄλλως | ποιήσεις· εἰ δὲ μή, | ἀδικήσεις.

⁶⁵ *Chrest. Wilck.* 166 (Arsinoite, 218 B.C.); *P.Heid.* VI 362 (Herakleopolite, 226 B.C.); and VII 393 (Arsinoite/Memphite, III B.C.).

A handful of government circulars likewise suggests that *oikonomoi* had higher standing than *archiphylakitai* in the third century. In perhaps as many as four instances, *oikonomoi* were listed before *archiphylakitai* among the addressees of official memoranda.⁶⁶ Two government documents from the second century provide perhaps the latest evidence for the superiority of the *oikonomos*. In the first, a record of a government auction, the *oikonomos* is listed first among the additional officials present at the proceedings, among these an *archiphylakitês*.⁶⁷ In the second, a circular, a number of officials including *archiphylakitai* received word from a higher (unknown) source of certain regulations from the office of the *oikonomos* concerning the royal bank.⁶⁸ By 140 B.C. the *archiphylakitês* appears to have gained ground on the *oikonomos*. This is suggested by two royal decrees in which *archiphylakitai* are listed before *oikonomoi* in the lists of addressees.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ *BGU* VI 1242.5–7 (Oxyrhynchite, III-II B.C.), an *entolê* from some tax-farmers addressed ἐπιστάτη [ο]ἰκονόμωι τοπογραμ[μα]τεῦσι κωμογραμ[μα]τεῦσι [ἀ]ρχ[ι]φυλακίταις φυλακίταις; *C.Ord.Ptol.*² 18.1–4 (Arsinoite?, 259–258 B.C.), a commandment concerning payment of the *apomoira* sent [τοῖς στρατηγῶσι καὶ τοῖς ἱπάρχαις] | [καὶ τοῖς ἡγεμόσι καὶ τοῖς νομάρχαις καὶ τοῖς τοπάρχαις καὶ τοῖς ἰοκ[ο]νόμοις καὶ τοῖς ἀντιγραφεῦσι καὶ τοῖς βασιλ[ικ]οῖς γραμ[μα]τεῦσι | [καὶ τοῖς λιβυάρχαις καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιφυλακίταις πάσι]; *P.Lille* 3.71–72 (Magdola, after 216–215 B.C.), a letter concerning a defaulting *topogrammateus* addressed τοῖς παρὰ Μητροδ[ω]ρου τοῦ οἰκ[ο]νόμου | καὶ τοῖς κωμογρ[α]μματεῦσι καὶ ἀρχιφυ[λακίταις] καὶ φυλακίταις (with *BL* 1.201 for reading); *P.Tebt.* III.1 708.2–6 (Tebtynis, III B.C.), a circular concerning the upcoming visit of a tax collector sent τοῖς ν[ο]μάρχαις καὶ τῶν οἰκ[ο]νόμων καὶ τοῖς βασιλ[ικ]οῖς γραμ[μα]τεῦσιν τ[ο]ῦ Ἄφροδιτοπολίτου καὶ Ἡρακλε[ο]πολίτου καὶ Ὀξ[υ]ρυγχίτου καὶ Κ[υ]νοπολίτου καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιφυ[λακίταις] | καὶ φυ[λακίταις].

⁶⁷ *P.Haun.* I 11 exterior ii.6–iii.1 (Diospolis Magna, 182 B.C.): συνπαρόντων καὶ αὐτοῦ Διονυσίου καὶ Ἀρνούφιου τοῦ τοπογραμ[μα]τέως καὶ Ἰμούθου κωμογρ[α]μματέως, | Μεγισθένου φρουράρχου, Λίχα ἀρχιφυλακίτου, Ἀριστογένου τῶν μεθ' Ἰπάλου ἡγεμόνων, Ἰασίβιος | ἐπιστάτου ἱπάρχιας καὶ ἄλλων πλειόνων. Dionysios is identified as *oikonomos* in exterior i.3; see *Pros. Ptol.* 1033 with add. = (?) 1034 with add.

⁶⁸ *P.Rain. Cent.* 46.1–7 (Arsinoite, II B.C.): [ca? τοῖς κατὰ κόμην ἐπιστάταις] | [τῶν ca?] τῶπων καὶ φρουράρχοις | [καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιφυλακίταις καὶ φυλακίταις καὶ | τῶν ca 6] | τραπεζίταις καὶ τοῖς σιτολόγοις | [καὶ τοπάρχαις καὶ κωμάρχαις καὶ κωμογραμ[μα]τεῦσι καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσι τῶν γεωργῶν | [καὶ τοῖς γεωργοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὑποτελέσι].

⁶⁹ In the first of these documents, the sovereigns addressed the complaints of a group of priests and requested that a number of officials guarantee the security of certain priestly revenues (*C.Ord.Ptol.*² 47.2–5 [Kerkeosiris?, 139 B.C.]: [τοῖς στρατηγῶσι καὶ

Epimelêtai

As the power of the *oikonomos* waned, that of the *epimelêtês* increased, at least *vis-à-vis* the *archiphylakitês*. We have already seen that as early as the third century a chief refused to obey the orders of an *oikonomos*, requiring instead that he receive instruction from the *epimelêtês* (*Chrest. Wilck.* 166; see above). Elsewhere an *epimelêtês* was asked to write to the *archiphylakitês* (and one other official, lost in lacuna) to provide protection for a petitioner (*P.Petr.* II 1 [Arsinoite, III B.C.]). These texts reveal that the *epimelêtês* had regular contact with chiefs. He also had supervisory jurisdiction over them. In fact, *archiphylakitai* may have answered to *epimelêtai* for personnel problems during the *genêmatophylakia*.⁷⁰ In one case a police officer informed another official (without title) that certain *genêmatophylakes* appointed by the police chief of the *meris* had failed to appear (*P.Tebt.* III.1 731 [Tebtynis/Ibion Eikosipentarouron, 153–152 or 142–141 B.C.]). The information was to be passed on to the *epimelêtês* for administrative processing.⁷¹ *Archiphylakitai* and other police agents were expected to hand over smugglers and their wares to

τοῖς φρουράρχοις καὶ τοῖς | [ἐπιστάταις τῶν φυλακῶν καὶ ἀρχιφυλακίταις καὶ ἐπιμεληταῖς | [καὶ οἰκονόμοις καὶ βασιλικαῖς γραμματεῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς | [τὰ βασιλικά πρᾶγματευσόμενοις]. The title of *oikonomos* was restored in the addressee-section of this document by the original editors based on the second decree, an ordinance outlawing extortion among officials in which *archiphylakitai* and *oikonomoi* were addressed in that order (*C.Ord.Ptol.*² 53.138–43 = 155–61 [Kerkeosiris?, 118 B.C.]: μηθένα δὲ λογεύειν μηθὲν παρὰ τῶν γεω(ργῶν) | καὶ τῶν ὑποτελῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπιπεπλεγμένων ταῖς προσόδοις καὶ μελεῖσσοιργῶν | καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὥστε τοῖς στρατηγοῖς | καὶ ἐπιστάταις τῶν φυ(λακῶν) ἢ ἀρχιφυ(λακίταις) ἢ οἰκονόμοις) ἢ τοῖς | παρ' αὐτῶν ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς πρὸς ταῖς | πρᾶγματείας καθ' ὄντινον τρόπον. Only two additional documents feature interactions between *archiphylakitai* and *oikonomoi*. In the first a man named Peteminis complained to the *dioikêtês* that the *oikonomos* had extorted a sum of money from him and asked that the former either arrange for a trial before the *chrêmatistai* or have an *archiphylakitês* mobilize his forces (the *phylakitai*) to bring the offender in (*P.Mich.* XVIII 778 [Mouchis, after 193–192 B.C.]). Matters did not improve. The *oikonomos* was not arrested, so Peteminis appealed to an agent of the *dioikêtês* to have the *phylakitai* deployed (*P.Mich.* XVIII 779 [Mouchis, after 192 B.C.]).

⁷⁰ On the *genêmatophylakia* see, for example, Bauschatz 148–52, 158–66; *P.Mich.* XVIII 769 pp99–103 with notes; and *P.Tebt.* I 27 with notes.

⁷¹ At least, this appears to be what the text suggests (8–10): ὄμμεθα δεῖν γράψαι[ν] | ἕν, εἰάν φαίνηται, ἀν[ενέγκης πρὸς ca 6] | τῶν διαδόχων καὶ ἐπιμελητῆν περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ λόγος τῶν [ca 15] | πρὸς αὐτὸν γένηται.

this official.⁷² The *epimelêtês* seems also to have acted upon financial crimes reported by *archiphylakitai*. In one instance the *archiphylakitês* of the village of Pois discovered someone breaking into a granary (*P.Tebt.* III.2 857 [Herakleopolite, 162 B.C.]). Subsequently, an investigation into the crime was opened by the *basilikos grammateus*, an agent of the *epimelêtês*, and the *epistatês phylakitôn*. A final example preserves a direct order from an *epimelêtês* to an *archiphylakitês* not to harass certain individuals until the former arrived to examine their statements (*P.Tebt.* III.1 741 [Tebtynis, 187–186 B.C.]). The original matter had concerned a debt of grain.

The *archiphylakitês*, *oikonomos*, and *epimelêtês* were all actively involved in state financial business and the administrative ties that bound them were crucial to the state's financial well-being. The connection between the three highlights once again the flexibility of the Ptolemaic police system. *Archiphylakitai* and their subordinates received requests from villagers and commands from civil and police officials concerning matters of law and order, but also provided an available source of muscle and manpower for the regulation of state finances at the town or village level. Chiefs received instruction from three different sets of government officials (*epistatai*, *epistatai phylakitôn*, and *oikonomoilepimelêtai*) from three different spheres of government (civil, police, and financial). The stationing of police chiefs throughout the *chôra* provided fast and reliable access to victims of crime, but also enabled the central government to ensure the protection of its resources—both human and financial—at all points. Those charged with supervising the economy could rest assured that in practically every corner of the Egyptian countryside there was an *archiphylakitês* on the ground with a contingent of *phylakitai* to enforce financial regulations. Chiefs of police and their subordinates were the natural choice for the safeguarding of crown assets.

CONCLUSIONS

As the most immediate level of judicial appeal, *archiphylakitai* were intimately connected to their local populations and served as the first line of defense against crime in the towns and villages of the Egyptian

⁷² See *P.Tebt.* III.1 709.1–3 (Tebtynis, 159 B.C.), where an official with the title *ho pros tēi diathesei tôn basilikôn chartôn* informs a number of village officials in Talei (among these the *epistatês*, the *archiphylakitês*, and the *phylakitai*) that they are to hand over both papyrus smugglers and their contraband to the *epimelêtês*.

chôra. They filled positions at the various administrative levels of the nome, but do not appear to have communicated directly with one another, instead receiving instruction from a handful of civil, police, and financial officials. The hierarchy of chiefs was flat and their widespread occurrence was designed to provide petitioners with fast and relatively direct access to government redress in even the most distant and sparsely settled areas, as well as to protect the state's financial interests throughout Egypt. These are important and surprising revelations, when one considers the long-held view of Ptolemaic bureaucracy: that it was a regular, rigidly structured system based on a generally lengthy, and correspondingly slow, chain of command.⁷³ The Ptolemaic system of law and order was an exception to the rule: a surprisingly diverse and efficient entity. *Archiphylakitai*, who occupied the lowest administrative rung on the law enforcement ladder, were its most flexible and functional cogs.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
1512 E. FIRST ST., #203
PO BOX 210105
TUCZON, AZ 85721-0105
JBAUSCHI@EMAIL.ARIZONA.EDU

⁷³ Manning 3–4 assails this traditional, but increasingly unpopular “strong state model” (his quotes) for Ptolemaic Egypt; see his notes 2 and 3 for a handful of its proponents; also Rostovtzeff 267–74 and Finley 154–55 on the rigidity of the Ptolemaic economic system (and Hellenistic economic systems in general); Bevan 132–39 and Hölbl 58–61 for the Ptolemaic bureaucracy (in Hölbl's case, that of Ptolemy I, II, and III); and Chauveau 87–90 on the status of native Egyptians under the Ptolemies.

WORKS CITED

- Bauschatz, J. “Policing the *Chôra*: Law Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt.” PhD diss., Duke University, 2005.
- Bengtson, H. *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht*. 3 vols. 2nd ed. München: Beck, 1964–1967.
- Berneker, E. *Die Sondergerichtsbarkeit im griechischen Recht Ägyptens*. München: Beck, 1935.
- Bevan, E. *The House of Ptolemy. A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*. Chicago: Argonaut, 1968.
- Bouché-Leclercq, A. *Histoire des Lagides*. 4 vols. Paris: Culture et Civilisation, 1963.
- Chauveau, M. *Egypt in the Age of Cleopatra: History and Society under the Ptolemies*. Translated by D. Lorton. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 2000.
- Crawford, D. “The Good Official of Ptolemaic Egypt.” In *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin*, edited by H. Maehler and V. M. Strocka, 195–202. Mainz: von Zabern, 1978.
- di Bitonto Kasser, A. “Le petizioni al re. Studio sul formulario.” *Aegyptus* 47 (1967): 5–57.
- . “Le petizioni ai funzionari nel periodo tolemaico. Studio sul formulario.” *Aegyptus* 48 (1968): 53–107.
- . “Frammenti di petizioni del periodo tolemaico. Studio sul formulario.” *Aegyptus* 56 (1976): 109–43.
- . “Nuove denunce all' ἐπιστάτης φυλακῶν.” *Aegyptus* 65 (1985): 3–13.
- Engers, M. *De Aegyptiarum ΚΩΜΩΝ administratione qualis fuerit aetate Lagidarum*. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1909.
- Finley, M. I. *The Ancient Economy*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999.
- Habermann, W. “Zur chronologischen Verteilung der papyrologischen Zeugnisse.” *ZPE* 122 (1998): 144–60.
- Handrock, P. *Dienstliche Weisungen in den Papyri der Ptolemäerzeit*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Universität zu Köln, 1967.
- Helmis, A. “Crime et châtement dans l'Égypte ptolemaïque. Recherches sur l'autonomie d'un modèle penal.” Thèse pour le Doctorat d'État en Droit, Université de Paris X (Nanterre), 1986.
- Hohlwein, N. *Le Stratège du nome*. 2nd ed. Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1969.
- Hölbl, G. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. Translated by T. Saavedra. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

- Hombert, M. and C. Préaux. "Recherches sur le *prosangelma* à l'époque ptolémaïque." *CE* 17 (1942): 259–86.
- Kool, P. *Die Phylakieten in Grieks-Romeins Egypt*. Amsterdam: Studentendrukkerij Poortpers, 1954.
- Kruse, T. "Zum βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς im ptolemäischen Ägypten. Bemerkungen zu John F. Oates, *The Ptolemaic Basilikos Grammateus*." *Tyche* 12 (1997): 149–58.
- . *Der königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung: Untersuchungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Ägyptens in der Zeit von Augustus bis Philippus Arabs (30. v. Chr.–245 n. Chr.)*. 2 vols. München: K. G. Saur, 2002.
- Lavigne, E. *De epistates van het Dorp in Ptolemaeisc Egypte*. Lovanii: Bibliotheca Universitatis, 1945.
- Lesquier, J. *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Paris: E. Leroux, 1911.
- Lewis, N. *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.
- . *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity: A Supplement*. Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1989.
- . *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt. Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*. 2nd ed. Oakville, Connecticut: American Society of Papyrologists, 2001.
- Manning, J. G. *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt. The Structure of Land Tenure*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- McGing, B. C. "Bandits, Real and Imagined, in Greco-Roman Egypt." *BASP* 35 (1998): 159–83.
- Mooren, L. "On the Jurisdiction of the Nome Strategoi in Ptolemaic Egypt." In *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Napoli, 19–26 maggio 1983)*, 1217–25. 3 vols. Napoli: Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi, 1984.
- Oates, J. *The Ptolemaic Basilikos Grammateus*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995.
- , R. S. Bagnall, S. J. Clackson, A. A. O'Brien, J. D. Sosin, T. G. Wilfong, and K. A. Worp. *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*. <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>>, September, 2007.
- Parca, M. "*Prosangelmata* ptolémaïques: une mise à jour." *CE* 60 (1985): 240–47.
- Peremans, W. "Die Amtsmissbrauche un ptolemäischen Ägypten." In *Korruption im Altertum: Konstanzer Symposium, Oktober 1979*, edited by W. Schuller, 103–33. München: R. Oldenbourg, 1982.
- Pestman, P. *A Guide to the Zenon Archive*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

- Rostovtzeff, M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.
- Thomas, J. D. "Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: The Dioiketes and the Nomarch." In *Das ptolemäische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin*, edited by H. Maehler and V. M. Strocka, 187–94. Mainz: von Zabern, 1978.
- and W. Clarysse. "P. Heid. Gr. inv. 1281 verso: an official document from the Ptolemaic period." In *Scritti in onore di Orsolina Montevicchi*, edited by E. Bresciani, G. Geraci, S. Pernigotti, and G. Susini, 401–06. Bologna: Clueb, 1981.
- Thompson, D. *Memphis under the Ptolemies*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1988.
- . "Policing the Ptolemaic Countryside." In *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.–19. 8. 1995*, edited by B. Kramer, W. Luppe, H. Maehler, and G. Poethke, 961–66. 2 vols. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997.
- Van 't Dack, E. "Les stratèges dans les Archives d' Assiout." In *Studia Hellenistica* 5, edited by L. Cerfaux and W. Peremans, 45–55. Lugduni Batavorum: Brill, 1948.
- . "Recherches sur l'administration du nome dans la Thébaidé au temps des Lagides." *Aegyptus* 29 (1949): 3–44.
- . *Ptolemaica*. Louvain: E. Nauwelaerts, 1951.
- . "L'épistate Artemôn: Un des fonctionnaires Lagides προκαθήμενοι τῆς χώρας." *AncSoc* 20 (1989): 147–58.
- Verhoogt, A. *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris: the Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120–110 B.C.)*. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Wolff, H. *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*. 2nd ed. München: Beck, 1970.