

XI.—The *Dux Ripae* at Dura

J. FRANK GILLIAM

YALE UNIVERSITY

Evidence has been found at Dura of the existence there of a *dux ripae* as early as A.D. 245. An attempt is made in this paper to throw light upon his office, first by comparing him with other *duces*, both later and contemporary. The evidence for a number of earlier *praefecti* whose functions seem to parallel his is next collected. Finally his position in the system of frontier defense in the East is studied.

The appearance of a *dux ripae* at Dura shortly before the middle of the third century is a matter of considerable interest for the history of the Eastern Frontier and of some importance as an illustration of the developments which marked the transition to the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine.¹ Before taking up the problems raised by the title of the *dux*, however, or attempting to define the position he held and to conjecture the reasons for the creation of his office, it will be necessary to examine the texts in which he is named.

The *dux* appears first in an entry on the verso of *Dura Papyrus* 3.² This document is a list of *equites* of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* with descriptions of their horses, the name and rank of the officer to whom the purchase and assignment of each horse had been referred for approval, the date, and finally the price. The dates extend from A.D. 245 to 251. A variety of officers are named. In six cases the approval had been given a *tunc pr<a>ef(ectis)*, in three a * Atilio Cosmino tunc co(n)s(ulari)*, and in two [a] *Pomponio Letiano v(iro) e(gregio) proc(uratore) Aug(ustorum) n(ostrorum) (duorum)*. In four lines the names and titles are not preserved. The *duces* appear in the last three lines. In lines 16 and 17 following

¹ I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor M. Rostovtzeff who, in addition to other kindnesses, has read my manuscript. No study has yet been made of the *dux*, nor has the evidence been published. See, however, the remarks of Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and its Art* (Oxford, 1938) 27-8, and C. B. Welles, "The Epitaph of Julius Terentius," *HThR* 34 (1941) 102, note 71.

² This papyrus is described briefly in *The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Preliminary Report of Fifth Season of Work* (New Haven, 1934) 296-7, and in the article of M. Rostovtzeff, "Das Militär-archiv von Dura," *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung* 19 (1934) 370-2. A new fragment of the document has since been found and a more complete transcription made, largely through the efforts of Mr. R. O. Fink.

the description of the horses one reads *a Licinnio Pacatiano tunc duc(e) IIII Idus Aug(ustas) Tittiano co(n)s(ule)* (A.D. 245), and in line 18 *probatum a Ulpio Tertio tunc duc(e) XV [.]ias III et II co(n)s(ulibus)* (A.D. 248).³

A third *dux* is named in two unpublished inscriptions from the Dolicheneum of the time of Gallus and Volusian. One of these is dated in the Seleucid year 562 = A.D. 250/1. Both were set up ἐπὶ Ἰουλ(ίου) Ἰουλιανοῦ κρατίστου δουκός.⁴

The title of the officer is given at greater length in a dipinto from the Palace of the Dux.⁵ This, the best preserved of a group of similar texts, reads as follows: *μνησθῇ Ἐλπιδηφόρος | ὁ Βυζάντιος τραγωδός | ὁ Δομιτίου [Πο]μπηιανοῦ | τοῦ ἀγνοῦ καὶ δικαίου δου | κός τῆς ρείπης θρεπτός | μετὰ Πρόβου τοῦ ὑποκρι | τοῦ αὐτοῦ. μνησθῇ ὁ ὥδε | μένων καὶ ὁ ἀναγεινώσκων.* Pompeianus appears again in another fragmentary dipinto from the same room and with *ἀγνός καὶ δίκαιος* in a third.⁶

³ When the phrases cited occur more than once, I have given the reading of the best preserved line without indicating lacunae elsewhere. I may note that the cognomen of Atilius is not certain. The papyrus seems to me to read *Cosmino*, although in one of the three instances where it appears it could be *Cosmiano*. The latter would make his identification with the Agilius Cosmianus or Cominius of *Cod. Iust.* 8.55 more certain (an official, otherwise unknown, to whom Philip addressed a rescript in 249). See Rostovtzeff, *loc. cit.* (see note 2) 371, note 23, and A. Stein in *PIR*². xi, no. 457a. For the name Cosminus, see *TLL*, *Onomasticon* 2.665. *Atilio* (in one case *Attilio*) is certain. In line 18 the last two letters of *cos* are represented by the long trailing second stroke of the *c*, and in line 17 *cos* is merely a waving line that continues the *o* of *Tittiano*. All three letters, however, are quite distinct in line 16 and in general in the other lines. The names of the *duces* and their dates are quite certain. The date in line 17 begins with *IIII Idus*. For the rather curious way of designating the consuls of the year, cf. *ILS* 7091. The month is probably to be restored as *Ma*ias.

⁴ The text dated by the Seleucid Era can be assigned to the summer or early fall of 251. The other inscription was very likely erected at the same time. For the Dolicheneum see Cte. du Mesnil du Buisson, *CRAI* 1936, 144–5.

⁵ For the building and for some general remarks on the *dux* see Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.* (see note 1) 27–8 and 52 and pl. X, 1. Cf. Cte. du Mesnil du Buisson, *CRAI* 1936, 145–7. From the development of the camp as a whole one may assume that the Palace of the Dux was built after the reign of Caracalla. The graffiti found in the building have not been read completely. Some of them seem to be accounts. I cannot discuss this and the other dipinti here. For *θρεπτός*, however, see A. Cameron, "Θρεπτός and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor," *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler* (Manchester, 1939) 27–62.

⁶ I have not been able to identify any of the *duces* with certainty. Iulianus may be the *praefectus legionis* in *ILS* 2771: *Iulio Iuliano v(iro) e(gregio) ducenar(io) praef(ecto) leg(ionis) I Parthicae Philippianae, duci devotissimo, Trebicius Gaudinus praef(ectus) alae novae firmae (miliariae) catafract(ariae) Philippianae, praeposito optimo*. The provenance of the inscription (Bostra), the rank of the equestrian *praefectus legionis*, and the date (A.D. 244–9) all make the identification attractive, but Iulius Iulianus is too common a name to permit much confidence. See, e.g., L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions* (Princeton, 1916) 117, 208.

With these texts may be considered the inscription from the City Arch, which was restored on the assumption that the *ἴνιος Πακατιανός* named in it was to be identified with Claudius Sollemnius Pacatianus, governor of Arabia in the time of Severus Alexander.⁷ Now that a high official named Licinius Pacatianus is known at Dura, it is very tempting to identify him with the personage honored in the inscription of the arch. But it must be observed that the latter was not only a senator (*λαμπρότατος* = *vir clarissimus*) but a man of consular rank (*ὕπατικός*), a fact, it seems to me, which makes the identification very questionable. It is difficult to believe that the office at Dura, while it was one of considerable importance, would have been of enough dignity for a *vir consularis*. Moreover, one would hardly expect to find a newly created military command entrusted to a member of the senatorial order in the middle of the third century.⁸ In any event, one cannot safely use the inscription of the arch, in particular the fact that Pacatianus was *consularis*, as evidence for the position of the *dux*. Fortunately the evidence of *Dura Papyrus* 3, the Dolicheneum inscriptions, and the dipinti from the Palace is sufficient to afford a basis for a study of the problems involved.

I shall attempt to analyze the position and function of the *dux ripae* later in more detail, but at this point it will suffice to emphasize

⁷ Edited by A. McN. G. Little and H. T. Rowell in *The Excavations at Dura-Europos. Preliminary Report of Fourth Season of Work* (New Haven, 1933) 72, no. 169; pl. XV, 2. The inscription as restored reads: [τὸν] λαμπρό | [τα]ρον ὕπατι | [κὸν] Κλαύδι | [ον] Σολλέμι | νιον Πακατι | ἀνὸν Ἀντίγον | ος Μαρίωνος | ἀρχιερεὺς τὸν | [ἐβερ-] γέτην]. Cf. *PIR*² 2.250, no. 1030; P. Lambrechts, *La composition du Sénat Romain de Septime Sévère à Dioclétien (193-284)* (Budapest, 1937) 47, no. 534. There is no indication from any other source, to be sure, that Claudius Sollemnius Pacatianus was ever governor of Syria Coele, but any such objection loses some of its force when one considers that for a period of fifty years in the middle of the third century the names of not more than two or three *legati* are known. See G. A. Harrer, *Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria* (Princeton, 1915) 47-8; E. Honigmann, *RE s. v.* "Syria," 1630. *Dura Papyrus* 3 adds another name. It is not necessary of course to assume that the *consularis* named in the arch was governor of Syria. He may, for example, have taken part in the campaign of Severus Alexander or in that of Gordian. It seems most natural, however, to think of him as the legate of Syria. But however that may be, the question of his identity, if he was not the *dux*, does not directly concern us here.

⁸ It is hardly necessary to insist upon this point. See the references cited below in note 14. It will be remembered that one of the *duces* is expressly called *κράτιστος*, i.e., *vir egregius*. See above, p. 158. It may be noted, furthermore, that in *Dura Papyrus* 3 we find *tunc consularis* distinguished from *tunc dux*. See above, pp. 157-8. However the possibility remains that the *dux ripae* in 245 was of consular rank. If this possibility were a certain fact, or even a probability, it would obviously be of considerable interest for the reign of Philip.

one important fact to be gathered from the material just presented. The office of the *dux* seems to have been a regular post, not an extraordinary mission. At least we know of three *duces* within a period of seven years, and it seems improbable that each one was sent out separately to take care of some emergency. Pompeianus, furthermore, was styled *δοῦξ τῆς ῥείπης*, which would hardly seem to describe the temporary command of the ordinary third century *dux*. The building of the Palace of the Dux also indicates that the new official took up permanent residence in Dura.⁹

Perhaps the most interesting point about the *dux ripae*, or *ripensis*, is his title, and the possibility immediately suggests itself that we have here a prototype and precursor of the *dux limitis* or *dux ripensis* of the fourth century.¹⁰ It will be advisable then before proceeding further to compare the *dux* at Dura with that officer and with the *duces* of the third century.¹¹

The *dux limitis*, as is well known, had a prominent rôle in the military and administrative structure of the Empire as reorganized during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine.¹² The provinces were at that time made more numerous and consequently smaller. Civil and military authority were generally separated, and the command of garrison troops along the frontier was given to officers of the equestrian order called *duces*.¹³ The army was divided into two parts: the garrison troops under the *duces* (the *riparienses*, *limitanei*, and *duciani*) and a central field army under the *magistri militum* (the *palatini* and *comitatenses*).¹⁴

⁹ For the Palace see above, note 5.

¹⁰ Professor Welles seems to feel that there is a direct connection between the officer at Dura and the Diocletian *dux*. See his article (cited in note 1) 102, note 71.

¹¹ A summary of the evidence for the periods both before and after Diocletian is given by O. Seeck in *RE s. v.* "Dux." Cf. Mommsen, "Dux," *Ges. Schr.* 6.204-5 and "Das römische Militärwesen seit Diocletian," *ibid.*, 272-3; R. Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Berlin, 1920) 152-80; and the brief remarks of A. von Domaszewski, "Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres," *BJ* 117 (1908) 117, 122, 170, 183, 189. For *duces* in the third century see L. Homo, *RH* 137 (1921) 169-80.

¹² The earliest reference to a *dux limitis* seems to be from the year 289 (*Paneg.* 2.3.3; ed. Baehrens, p. 265). A full bibliography for Diocletian and Constantine and their reforms is given in *CAH* 12.760-3.

¹³ It is perhaps worth noting that there was a *dux Euphratensis et Syriae*; *Not. dign. or.* 1.44; 33; *Cod. Theod.* 7.11.2; 15.11.2.

¹⁴ The process of separating civil and military authority as well as the systematic division of provinces appears to have begun under Gallienus. The provincial military commanders do not, however, seem to have been called *duces* before Diocletian. The reform of Gallienus has been the subject of considerable discussion. See C. W. Keyes,

One might at first be inclined to regard the *dux ripae* at Dura as essentially a *dux* of the later type appearing some fifty years before his time, for there are certain resemblances between the two officials aside from the striking similarity, or even identity, of their titles. The *dux ripae*, that is, seems to have been of equestrian rank,¹⁵ and like the *dux limitis* in the fourth century he was primarily a military officer and more specifically a commander of a group of frontier garrisons. Whatever the area under his jurisdiction may have been, moreover, it apparently included only a part of Syria Coele, and in this one might perhaps see a resemblance to the policy under Diocletian of decreasing the size of provincial military commands.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between the Dura *dux* and the later officer. An essential point of the reforms of Diocletian, as noted above, was the division of the civil and military *imperium* of the old provincial governor between two equal and independent officers. But there can be little doubt that the *dux ripae* was a subordinate of the legate of Syria Coele, and there is little reason, it seems to me, to suppose that there was a separation of civil and military authority in that part of the province with which the *dux* was concerned.¹⁶ In other words, while the *dux* of the time of

The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire (Princeton, 1915) 49–54; Grosse, *op. cit.* (see note 11) 8–11; N. H. Baynes, "The Effect of the Edict of Gallienus," *JRS* 15 (1925) 195–201; M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* 407, 617, note 35; A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand* (Munich, 1927) 449–59; J. G. C. Anderson, "The Genesis of Diocletian's Provincial Re-organization," *JRS* 22 (1932) 24–32; L. De Regibus, "Le riformi militari dell'imperatore Gallieno," *Historia* 9 (1935) 446–64; Lambrechts, *op. cit.* (see note 7) 96–104; and the remarks of Alföldi, Ensslin, and Mattingly in *CAH* 12.183, 197, 220, 308, 376–8. Cf. L. Homo, "Les privilèges administratifs du Sénat romain sous l'Empire et leur disparition graduelle au cours du III^e siècle," *RH* 137 (1921) 161–203; 138 (1921) 1–52; and G. Lopuszański, "La transformation du corps des officiers supérieurs dans l'armée romaine du I^{er} au III^e siècle après J.-C.," *MEFR* 55 (1938) 131–83. F. Reiche in his study *Ueber die Teilung der Zivil- und Militärgevalt im dritten Jahrhundert der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Breslau, 1900) attempted to prove that the reform of Gallienus resulted in the creation of *duces* in the Diocletian sense, but the evidence he presented is not convincing. On the basis of certain statements in the *Historia Augusta* Borghesi concluded that the separation took place as early as Severus Alexander (*Oeuvres complètes* 5.397). This view was once widely accepted, among others by H. Schiller (*Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, see index, s. v. "dux"), but is, so far as I know, no longer maintained.

¹⁵ I shall discuss the rank of the *dux ripae* below. Cf. notes 8 and 47. For Diocletian *duces ripenses* see *Not. dign. or.* 1.55; 42; *Cod. Theod.* 15.1.13 (*dux Daciae ripensis*); *Not. dign. occ.* 1.42; 33 (*dux Valeriae ripensis*).

¹⁶ The naming of the *consularis* in *Dura Papyrus* 3 as the officer approving the assignment of horses to members of a Dura unit (the consuls are those of 251) indicates

Diocletian and later was the independent commander of all the forces in his province, the *dux ripae* was a subordinate of the provincial legate whose authority extended over only a part of the Syrian garrison. It must be concluded, I think, that while the *dux ripae*, like the three Parthian legions of Septimius Severus and the equestrian prefect placed by that emperor over Mesopotamia, does in some respects foreshadow later developments, his resemblance to the *dux limitis* is by no means complete.

In the period before Diocletian there are instances of *dux* being used in a more or less technical sense, and it will be necessary at this point to consider these. It may be noted first that the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* several times mention *duces* with the fourth century meaning of the title. Upon examination, however, it will be found that the officer is usually named in a highly suspicious context, and one need not hesitate therefore to disregard these passages and rely entirely on the epigraphical evidence.¹⁷

In the third century and even earlier one finds *dux* variously used in inscriptions. The title seems on occasion to have been given to a provincial governor or to some other official in order to indicate distinction gained in active campaigning during his term of office. It occurs with this force as early as the reign of Marcus Aurelius in the case of two governors of Dacia and in that of a procurator of Mauretania Tingitana.¹⁸ A legate of Hispania Citerior in the time of Septimius Severus is more specifically described as *dux terra*

clearly, it seems to me, that the city was included within his province and that its garrison formed part of his command. General considerations would seem to point to the same conclusion. The *ducatus* was presumably created in order to strengthen the frontier defenses, and it is hard to see how this end would be served by detaching it from the rest of Syria. In any crisis the district along the Euphrates would require reinforcements from the more heavily garrisoned North, and it would have been much more difficult to handle such a situation efficiently if two separate military administrations were set up. However, we do not have sufficient evidence to determine exactly what the relationship between the *dux* and the legate was. The equestrian *dux* in practice may have enjoyed considerable independence, and one may perhaps regard the creation of his office as another indication of the gradual loss by the senatorial governors of their authority in military affairs.

¹⁷ Cf. above note 14. The *duces* are almost invariably named in letters and speeches or in passages which are otherwise suspicious. See, for instance, the remarks of Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* 6.221, note 2 and 7.311-3; Homo, *RH* 137 (1921) 169-80; Baynes, *JRS* 15 (1925) 196. The pertinent references will be found collected by these writers. Cf. *TLL* 5.2321.

¹⁸ In *ILS* 1097 a *legatus Augusti pro praefectore trium Daciarum et Moesiae superioris* is addressed as *fortissimus dux* (A.D. 169/70); *ILS* 1099 was set up to a *consularis et dux trium Daciarum* (A.D. 170); the procurator is also *fortissimus dux* (*ILS* 1354, probably from the same period).

marique adversus rebelles.¹⁹ In like fashion a *praefectus legionis* during the reign of Philip is called *dux devotissimus*.²⁰

At times *dux* was also employed, more technically, to designate the commander of troops temporarily assembled for a campaign or some extraordinary mission. As early as the end of the first century one discovers a *dux exercitus Africi et Mauretanici ad nationes quae sunt in Mauretania conprimendas* who held this office in the course of a long career in which he rose from a *primus pilus* to *procurator Raetiae*.²¹ Of more exalted rank was Iulius Quadratus, a prominent figure of the time of Trajan, who in an inscription from Pergamum is called *στρατηλάτης γενόμενος Δακικοῦ πολέμου* = *dux exercitus*.²² Closely corresponding to him in rank and position were Claudius Candidus, *dux exercitus Illyrici expeditione Asiana item Parthica item Gallica* during the campaigns of Septimius Severus,²³ and Marius Maximus, who in the same reign had been *dux exerciti* (sic) *Mysiaci apud Byzantium et apud Lugudunum*.²⁴ Another man of senatorial rank during the same years held the title of *dux vexillationum*.²⁵ Sometime during the third century, to list a few more examples, a commander of the fleet at Misenum was employed as *dux per Africam Numidiam Mauretaniamque*,²⁶ and one finds a *dux legionum cohortium alarum Britanicimiarum* (sic) *adversus Armoricanos* who had also been commander of the same fleet.²⁷ The officer, finally, who was charged with the construction of the walls of Verona in A.D. 265 was termed *dux ducenarius*.²⁸

In some of the inscriptions which I have cited *dux* seems roughly equivalent to *praepositus*. This meaning is quite clear in the *cursus honorum* of a *primus pilus* who became *dux legionis III Italicae* and *dux et praepositus legionis III Augustae*.²⁹ His office

¹⁹ ILS 1140.

²⁰ By a *praefectus alae* in ILS 2771 (quoted above in note 6). *Dux devotissimus* would hardly mean more than *praepositus optimus*.

²¹ ILS 9200.

²² See W. Weber, *APAW* 1932.5.83, 86; R. Herzog, *SPAW* 1933.411; A. von Premerstein, *SBAW* 1934.3.18-19; cf. 29, 35, 62. I am indebted for these references to Professor Rostovtzeff.

²³ ILS 1140.

²⁴ ILS 2935.

²⁵ ILS 1142.

²⁶ ILS 2774.

²⁷ ILS 2770 (undated).

²⁸ ILS 544. But on the expansion of *duc. duc.*, see Keyes, *op. cit.* (see note 14) 51, note 2, and Baynes, *JRS* 15 (1925) 200.

²⁹ ILS 2772.

is paralleled by that of another *primus pilus* who was *dux legionum Daciae* in the time of Philip.³⁰ To these two texts should be added one from the Chersonese which describes an *eques Romanus* as *dux per quadriennium legionis XI Claudiae*.³¹ The *duces* of this type are, of course, to be connected with the emergence of equestrian *praefecti legionum* in the third century rather than with the fourth century *duces limitum*.³²

One may conclude, I think, that none of the contemporary or earlier *duces* cited in this brief survey resembles the *dux ripae* of Dura at all closely. In no instance known to me was a post regularly filled by a *dux* with jurisdiction over a definite region and with an established number of units under his command. It is clear from the inscriptions, however, that *dux* was gradually becoming part of the official terminology,³³ and it was for this reason that the officer at Dura was called *dux* rather than *praepositus* or *praefectus*, for example. The title was employed there as elsewhere because the office was not a regular one in the imperial army, at the same time possibly designating a more important office than *praepositus* or *praefectus* would have done. But while in other parts of the Empire some crisis or unusual situation resulted occasionally in the appointment of a *dux* for a short period, the peculiar problems of frontier defense on the Middle Euphrates after the Sassanid danger became pressing could not be met by temporary measures. The crisis there was continual and necessitated the naming of a *dux* as a permanent officer.³⁴

It is the title of the *dux ripae* that first attracts one's attention, and a comparison with other *duces* was necessary to determine

³⁰ ILS 2773.

³¹ ILS 9203. The tenure of the post through a quadriennium is interesting.

³² See Keyes, *op. cit.* (see note 14) 18-41 and the references above in note 14.

³³ This would seem to be true in particular from the time of Septimius Severus. It is hardly necessary to observe that one cannot assume that all the officials called *dux* in the inscriptions were so styled officially.

³⁴ It seems reasonable to assume that the creation of a *ducatus* with its center at Dura was directly occasioned by the Sassanid menace which constantly threatened Dura and the rest of the Euphrates frontier from the latter part of the reign of Severus Alexander. The provinces along the Rhine and Danube, which were of course also subjected to great pressure all through this period, were primarily military districts extending along the frontier, and the existing organization could take care of the situation under ordinary circumstances. The problem there was not one of supervising a border district at a distance but of concentrating reinforcements under a superior command in times of danger. But the governor of Syria Coele could hardly carry on the routine work of administration in Antioch and keep watch over the Euphrates frontier at the same time. See below, pp. 170-174.

whether the officer at Dura resembled them in anything beyond his title. But it is equally if not more important to compare the *dux* with other officers whose position and duties may have been to a certain degree similar.

The *dux ripae* was a military officer whose duty it was to watch over a certain district (the *ripa*) and to protect it from sudden incursions which were at all times imminent. He was a subordinate of the legate of Syria Coele and in turn probably had under his command a number of inferior officers and their detachments stationed up and down the Euphrates.

Certain parallels to his office as thus defined, although not very close ones perhaps, may be found if one shifts the emphasis from his title to his position in the system of frontier defense and to his jurisdiction, the *ripa*.³⁵ The position of a legionary legate in command of a camp some distance removed from the provincial governor, to begin with a rather remote parallel, would not have been entirely dissimilar. In all probability the legate would have exercised some sort of supervision over the neighboring territory and the auxiliary troops and *castella* in the region. One may cite in particular the case of the legate of the *legio III Augusta* before the creation of the province of Numidia.

The function, however, of a number of officers who were responsible for the policing of difficult regions in various parts of the Empire would seem to have been more like that of the *dux ripae*. One of these officers, the *praefectus praesidiorum et montis Berenididis* in Egypt, was in charge of a considerable area of desert country.³⁶ In Hispania Citerior one finds a *praefectus orae maritimae* who was evidently concerned with defense against the pirates of

³⁵ For the fiscal *ripae* see H. Lehner, *Germania* 16 (1932) 106-8; E. Stein, *Die kaiserlichen Beamten und Truppenkörper im römischen Deutschland unter dem Prinzipat* (Vienna, 1932) 46-7; H. Nesselhauf, "Publicum portorii Illyrici utriusque et ripae Thraciae," *Epigraphica* 1 (1939) 331-8; A. Dobó, "Publicum portorium Illyrici," *AErI*, ser. 3.1 (1940) 144-94. The *ripa* over which the *dux* exercised authority was simply a section of the *limes* along the Euphrates. It constituted the military and political frontier of the Empire and at the same time marked the customs boundary between the Romans and the Persians. There can be little doubt that the *dux* must have been occupied almost exclusively with military affairs. Whether he had anything to do with fiscal affairs, directly or indirectly, we cannot tell. In any event, foreign trade and commerce in the Middle Euphrates region must have been declining in importance in the middle of the third century. For the use of *ripa* in connection with *limites*, see Fabricius, *RE* s. v. "Limes," 573-4. Cf. the later *riparienses milites*, for whom see Seeck, *RE* s. v. "Riparienses."

³⁶ See J. Lesquier, *L'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Cairo, 1918) 427-31, and J. G. C. Anderson, *CAH* 10.245-6.

Mauretania,³⁷ and no doubt the *praefectus orae Ponticae*,³⁸ the Mauretanian *praefectus orae maritimae*,³⁹ and the *praefectus Bali-arum insularum*⁴⁰ all had similar duties. Another group of *praefecti* kept watch over the great rivers that flowed along the frontier of the Empire: the *praefectus ripae fluminis Euphratis*,⁴¹ the *praefecti ripae Danuvii* (one is known from Pannonia⁴² and another from Moesia⁴³), and the *praefectus ripae Rheni*.⁴⁴

³⁷ ILS 2672, 2714, 2714a, 2715, 2716; CIL 2.4224; Ann. épig. 1929, nos. 230, 234. See H. Dessau, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit* 2.2.452. One may cite as an example of the piratical incursions those in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. See A. von Premerstein, *KI* 12 (1912) 167–8 and R. Thouvenot, *REA* 41 (1939) 20–28. For this office and the following see also Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* 1.554; and 2.535, 537–8; von Domaszewski, "Rangordnung" (see note 11) 136–7; Lehner, *loc. cit.* (see note 35).

³⁸ Plin. *Ad Traianum* 21 [32]; 86A [18]. See M. Rostovtzeff in the *Enciclopedia Italiana*, 27.904, and especially his article "Pontus, Bithynia and the Bosporus" in *ABS* 22 (1916–8) 12–13, 19.

³⁹ CIL 11.5744.

⁴⁰ ILS 9196.

⁴¹ ILS 2709. V. Chapot thought that the *praefectus* might be connected with the Parthian expedition of Trajan; *La frontière de l'Euphrate de Pompée à la conquête Arabe* (Paris, 1907) 146. The inscription was assigned to the first century because of the form of the letters (*basis, litteris optimis saeculi opinor primi*: Hirschfeld, *CIL* 12.1357; cf. Chapot, *loc. cit.*). In support of such a date I may point out the fact that the *praefectus* had been a tribune in the *legio XXI Rapax*, which did not exist after the end of the reign of Domitian. For the history of the legion see E. Ritterling, *RE* s. v. "Legio" 1789–90. His only other military office was that of *praefectus alae*. I doubt that there was any direct connection between the office of the *praefectus* and that of the *dux*. The *praefectus*, I should imagine, was primarily concerned with the policing of the Euphrates, perhaps with the aid of a small river fleet. He would presumably have a certain rôle to play in case of a Parthian war, but, unlike the *dux*, he would not have the responsibility of holding a heavily fortified *limes* against the constant threat of well-organized powerful enemies. In any event the *praefectus* could not have had anything to do with the Euphrates below the Chabur at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. Whether or not the office of the *praefectus* continued to exist after the first years of the second century we cannot tell. Cf. below, note 46.

I may note here the *cursus honorum* of Aburnius Torquatus (Ann. épig. 1911, no. 161) who in the time of Trajan's Parthian war was ἐπιμελητὴς εὐθηνίας ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ Παρθικῷ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Εὐφράτου. The inscription (from Alabanda) was edited by A. von Premerstein in *JEA* 13 (1910) 200–9 (see esp. 204–5). See also R. Paribeni, *Optimus Princeps* 2 (Messina, 1927) 289; J. Guey, *Essai sur la guerre parthique de Trajan* (114–117) (Bucharest, 1937) 114; and for the office in general, D. van Berchem, "L'annonce militaire dans l'empire romain au III^e siècle," *MSAF* 80 (1937) 117–202, esp. 142–146. Cf. Guey, *MEFR* 55 (1938) 56–77.

⁴² ILS 2737. See R. Syme, *CAH* 10.805, and A. Alföldi, *CAH* 11.545–6. One may also cite the *praefecti civitatum*. See, e.g., O. Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*² (Berlin, 1905) 382–3. The Danubian *praefecti* all seem to belong to the first century.

⁴³ Ann. épig. 1926, no. 80. See Syme, *CAH* 10.805. For a similar officer near the mouth of the river see *SEG* 1.329; Syme, *loc. cit.*; J. Keil, *CAH* 11.574.

⁴⁴ Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.55, cf. 4.26 and 64. A third century inscription mentioning a *p(rae)p(ositus) L (= quinquagesimae) rip(a)e Rheni leg(ionis) I M(inerviae)* is dis-

About none of these *praefecti* do we know much more than that they existed. Most of them seem to have this in common: they were military officers directly charged with the protection of certain areas which presented unusual problems. Their offices were more territorial and more local in character than that of a commander of an individual unit, who was primarily concerned with his unit and only secondarily with the region in which it was stationed. Another point to be observed is that they all would appear to have been under the command of a higher official.⁴⁵ These *praefecti* then present certain resemblances to the *dux ripae*, but the resemblances should not be exaggerated. They were on the whole largely employed in police work, or possibly fiscal affairs, and though their patrols might occasionally have met with difficult problems, the task of the *dux ripae* in holding back the Persians was of a much more serious nature. It must be remembered, moreover, when comparing our third century *dux* with these *praefecti*, that it is possible that none of them survived much beyond the beginning of the second century.⁴⁶

In studying the *dux ripae* it has seemed advisable first to compare him with other *duces* of various periods and then to examine a number of officers whose duties and position appear to have resembled, to some extent, those of the *dux* at Dura. But when these investigations have been made, a number of problems still remain to be studied, such as the rôle of the *dux* in the defense of

cussed by Lehner, *loc. cit.* (see note 35) 106-8 and Stein, *op. cit.* (see note 35) 47. Cf. *CIL* 3.13814a (Moesia Superior): *Su(b) c(ura) Hermogeni p(rae)p(ositi) rip(a)e leg(ionis) VII Cl(audiae) Parce . . .* (not cited by Lehner or Stein). Ritterling would date the Moesian inscription in the fourth century, *RE s. v.* "Legio," 1625 (cf. the other inscriptions which he lists there).

Lehner (followed by Stein) thought that the *praepositus* was the direct successor of the earlier *praefectus*. If he is correct, this would seem to be the only instance where any of the group which I have been discussing appears after the first few years of the second century. But I doubt strongly that the third century *praepositus* held the same office as the *praefectus* mentioned by Tacitus. Lehner and Stein in general place too much stress upon the fiscal aspect of the *praefecti*. For the fourth century office of *praefectus ripae legionis* see Grosse, *op. cit.* (see note 11) 151.

⁴⁵ That this was true one may assume from the character of the military organization of the Empire. We have specific information in the case of the *praefectus orae Ponticae* (see above, note 38).

⁴⁶ I know of no dated inscription or other evidence which would indicate that any of them did, but one would be ill-advised to make too much of this *argumentum ex silentio*. It seems probable *a priori*, however, that certain of the *praefecti* would have become unnecessary in the second century; see von Domaszewski, "Rangordnung" (see note 11) 136-7. For a possible exception see above, note 44.

the eastern provinces, the relation in which he stood to other officials, the territory under his jurisdiction, and the date of the creation of his office. One cannot hope to answer all the questions which arise with precision and finality, but by combining what specific information we have concerning the *dux* with our knowledge of the eastern frontier as a whole, one can give answers which, while tentative and based in part on hypothesis, still have considerable probability.

It will be well to begin by listing some important facts concerning the *dux*. As one would expect, the *dux* appears to have been of equestrian rank;⁴⁷ he was almost certainly a subordinate of the governor of Syria Coele;⁴⁸ in all probability he had his headquarters at Dura where his Palace was built for him;⁴⁹ and finally, as noted above,⁵⁰ the *dux* seems to have been introduced as a permanent officer. With these points in mind we may proceed to a more general discussion.

A unified command did exist in the East from time to time when the emperor himself appeared in that region or when some special appointment was made. But no one would be likely to suggest that the *dux* ever had charge of the entire eastern frontier. A subordinate of the governor of Syria Coele with headquarters at Dura would have been a most unlikely candidate for such a position. As a matter of fact we happen to know that the brother of Philip the Arab had the title of *rector Orientis* and was presumably charged with the coördination of affairs in the East at a time when there was a *dux* at Dura.⁵¹ The *dux* evidently played his rôle within the framework of the old provincial organization.

⁴⁷ Iulianus is *κράτιστος* in the Dolicheneum inscriptions (see above, p. 158), which indicates that he, like the *dux* of the time of Diocletian, was an *eques*, although the equation *κράτιστος* = *vir egregius* is not without exceptions. See D. Magie, *De romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis solemnibus in graecum sermonem conversis* (Leipzig, 1905) 31, 51, 112; A. Stein, *WS* 34 (1912) 161-2; O. Hornickel, *Ehren- und Rangprädikate in den Papyrusurkunden* (Giessen, 1930) 20-2. For the possibility that one of the *duces* was of the senatorial order see above, p. 159 and note 8.

⁴⁸ Cf. above, note 16. At least two official letters of Marius Maximus, known to have been governor of Syria Coele, have been found at Dura (one of these is *Dura Papyrus* 4; see below, note 62). Cf. the phrase *a tunc co(n)s(ulari)* in *Dura Papyrus* 3 (see above, p. 157) which can only refer to the governor at Antioch.

⁴⁹ See note 5. The dipinti of the mimes were found in the Palace. See above, p. 158.

⁵⁰ See above, pp. 159-160.

⁵¹ See Stein in *RE* s. v. "Iulius" (no. 409 = C. Iulius Priscus) 781-2. Cf. Keyes, *op. cit.* (see note 14) 52-4.

During the middle of the third century Rome in the East was menaced by the Persians all along the frontier. About the northern section of the *limes* at this period we know little, but it would appear that it did not play as important a part as it had earlier. Most of the fighting between the Romans and the Persians took place in Mesopotamia. The province was naturally heavily garrisoned⁵² and strongly fortified, for though it was not so rich and valuable as Syria, it was more important from the military point of view. In general it bore something of the same relationship to Syria as did the Germanies to Gaul. The Persians could hardly penetrate to Antioch without first overrunning Mesopotamia and disposing of at least part of its garrison, which was too strong to be left behind intact.

Syria Coele bordered on the Sassanian Empire only below the Chabur, to the north of which it was of course covered by Mesopotamia. The province, however, was still strongly garrisoned, though we have very little information as to details.⁵³ One fact that is known and which is significant for the present study is that both Syrian legions appear to have been stationed in the north of the province.⁵⁴ The responsible authorities would seem to have been primarily concerned with the defense of Antioch and Northern Syria, and not without reason when one remembers that the Persians several times broke through Mesopotamia and threatened or even took the capital.⁵⁵ That the *dux ripae* had anything to do with the troops in the north, situated at a great distance from Dura and comparatively near the seat of the legate, seems most unlikely. One must conclude, I believe, that the *dux* in all probability com-

⁵² There were two legions stationed there. See Ritterling, *loc. cit.* (see note 41) 1435-6, 1539-40; and F. Schachermeyr, *RE* s. v. "Mesopotamien," 1161-3. Unfortunately little is known of the auxiliary troops in the garrison. No Mesopotamian *diploma* has been found.

⁵³ The book of Chapot (see note 41) is now antiquated. A good short survey of the Syrian *limes* is given by Fabricius, *RE* s. v. "Limes" 650-1, 654-6. Reference should also be made to the valuable work of A. Poidebard, recorded in his *La trace de Rome dans le désert de Syrie* (Paris, 1934), and of Sir Aurel Stein, "Un récente exploration en Transjordanie," *CRAI* 1939, 262-8; "Surveys on the Roman Frontier in Iraq and Trans-Jordan," *GJ* 95 (1940) 428-38. A short summary of Stein's investigations is contained in *PalEF* 73 (1941) 18-21.

⁵⁴ See Ritterling, *loc. cit.* (see note 41), 1560-1, 1765-6. Too little is known to say anything about the distribution of the auxiliaries, but presumably a good many would be stationed in the neighborhood of the legions.

⁵⁵ Our information as to details is rather scanty and unreliable. See the references below in note 66.

manded only the forces which formed the garrison of the lower part of the Euphrates *limes* of Syria.⁵⁶

But though the *dux ripae* was apparently not the chief military officer even in his own province, it is easy to understand why his office was essential and important. That part of Syria Coele which lay below the Chabur and which was consequently not protected by Mesopotamia was subject to continual raids and to attacks of a more serious nature. The governor at Antioch, who would be fully occupied with other matters, could not visit such a remote region very often or direct efficiently the defense of the area. An obvious solution of the difficulty was to coördinate the forces there under a commander stationed at a strategic point. The peculiar circumstances which led to the creation of the office perhaps explain why no *dux ripae* has been found elsewhere, for as far as I know they were not paralleled in other provinces.

The importance of the area around Dura, as well as its exposed position, explains why the government was prepared to take special steps for its defense. In the first place, Parapotamia was itself fertile and populous enough to deserve protection from Persian raids. The occupation of the region from the Chabur to the great bend in the Euphrates was also necessary for the control of the caravan routes between Palmyra and the river. The strategic value of the region, however, was what probably impressed officials most.⁵⁷ This it owed largely to the fact that through it passed the road up the Euphrates to Antioch.⁵⁸

That part of the *limes*, then, which had its center at Dura was valuable, in particular for the defense of the Upper Euphrates, and useful as a base for expeditions sent down the river, but its importance should not be exaggerated. The Dura garrison was not strong enough to prevent a large Persian force from passing by the city,⁵⁹ nor was possession of the city and the adjacent territory

⁵⁶ Cf. above, pp. 161-2 and note 16. It is conceivable that the jurisdiction of the *dux* might have extended over a portion of Mesopotamia along the Lower Chabur, but this seems improbable.

⁵⁷ For the strategic importance of Dura see, e.g., F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos (1922-1923)* (Paris, 1926) xiii-xiv.

⁵⁸ The importance of Dura for the defense of Northern Syria and Antioch probably explains why it was included in Syria Coele. Cf. above, note 48.

⁵⁹ Around A.D. 250 the garrison of Dura consisted of at least two auxiliary cohorts and a vexillation of a third, with the addition possibly of some of the legionary vexillations which are known to have been stationed there in the time of Caracalla and Severus Alexander. One may estimate the total as from 1400 to, possibly, 1750. It may have been higher at times.

necessary to the Persians before advancing towards Antioch.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, a well-fortified *limes* here would offer real difficulties to the enemy. It was, moreover, important for the Romans to keep the region in their own hands, for if the Persians gained control of it, they would have a very useful base for raiding Syria.

The first duty of the *dux*, it would seem, was to maintain the frontier defenses at a high level of efficiency and to prevent as best he could any sudden inroad of the enemy. One of his incidental tasks very likely would be to inform himself concerning the activity of the Persians through scouts and spies, not only for his own benefit but also for that of his superiors who would naturally desire to make use of the advantages Dura enjoyed in this respect. He could hardly cope, of course, with a large-scale invasion which would overpower the forces at his command unless support was given in time by the provincial administration. But nevertheless he was a personage of considerable importance, one whose position is reflected in the palace built for him.⁶¹

For the extent of territory under the *dux ripae* we have no direct evidence. In all probability he was in charge of all the Roman *limes* to the south, as far as Biblada perhaps.⁶² But it is more difficult to determine the northern limit of his district. *Dura Papyrus* 4 names two places up the river, Appadana and Gazica.⁶³ There is some indication, furthermore, that in both Parthian and Roman times Dura was an administrative center for a region which included part of the Lower Chabur.⁶⁴ Perhaps the most one can

⁶⁰ Dura was almost certainly never captured before 256 though Antioch was several times threatened and perhaps even taken before that date. See note 66.

⁶¹ See above, note 5. The fact that he included mimes in his household indicates that he had a considerable establishment.

⁶² Valuable information for the section of the *limes* dependent on Dura in the time of Severus is given in *Dura Papyrus* 4, a letter of Marius Maximus arranging for the reception of a Parthian envoy. See M. Rostovtzeff, *CRAI* 1933, 319–20 and *Münchener Beiträge* 19 (1934) 375–6; *Fifth Dura Report* (see note 2), 297–8; F. Cumont in *CAH* 11.860. Below Dura are listed two *castella*, *Ed[da]na* (Giddan in Isidore of Charax) and *Bi[blada]* (probably the Belesi Biblada of Isidore). To the north are Appadana (not identified unless it is the town on the Chabur) and Gazica (Asicha in Isidore). Professor Rostovtzeff has discussed the identification of the sites and the significance of the list in the two articles referred to above. Quite recently Sir Aurel Stein has announced the discovery of a Roman *castellum* at what he believes to be the site of Belesi Biblada. See *CRAI* 1939, 266; *GJ* 95.431 (cf. above, note 53).

⁶³ See note 62.

⁶⁴ For a summary of the evidence see C. B. Welles, *Seventh and Eighth Dura Report* (see note 2) 436–8. The place names in *Dura Papyrus* 12, a muster-roll of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* drawn up around A.D. 220, when studied and identified, will no

say is that his jurisdiction presumably reached at least to the mouth of the Chabur and possibly on to the next center of importance. We know too little about the *limes* above the Chabur at this time to say more. As his title indicates, the *dux ripae* would probably not be concerned with anything beyond a strip along the Euphrates, for instance with Palmyra.⁶⁵

The *ducatus* was apparently a measure for defense against the Persian danger and was presumably created at some date between the establishment of the Sassanid dynasty in A.D. 226/7 and 245 when Licinius Pacatianus was holding the office. Our information does not permit a more precise statement, but perhaps from the history of the eastern frontier during these years one may indicate some probabilities.⁶⁶ It does not seem likely that the office was set up during the few years before the first major effort of the Roman government to meet the new situation, the expedition of Alexander in 231/2. At the time of his return to the West, however, it may have seemed advisable to reorganize the *limes* and appoint a *dux ripae*. Or it may have been necessary during the campaign in Mesopotamia to secure the Middle Euphrates by entrusting it to a *dux* appointed for the purpose, perhaps at first temporarily and then permanently when the office proved useful.

There may be an indication of this early date in the speech which Herodian makes Maximinus deliver at the news of Gordian's rebellion (7.8.4). After speaking of the Germans and Sarmatians, he says: Πέρσαι τε οἱ πάλαι Μεσοποταμίαν κατατρέχοντες νῦν ἡσυχάζουσιν, ἀγαπητῶς ἔχοντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν, δόξης τε τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἀρετῆς [τε], πείρα τῶν ἐμῶν πράξεων, ἃς ἔγνωσαν ὅτε τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁχθαῖς στρατοπέδων ἡγούμεν, ἀνεχούσης αὐτοῖς. The office held by Maximinus, although to assume that he held any territorial command is quite unnecessary, is generally said to have been that of *praefectus Mesopotamiae*.⁶⁷ But it is conceivable, if one may translate *στρατόπεδα* here as *castra*, that he was a *dux ripae* and, if so, the first.⁶⁸ His earlier

doubt be illuminating. Appadana is very frequently named, as is Magdala. BIRTHA also occurs.

⁶⁵ Palmyra in any event was in a different province (Syria Phoenice).

⁶⁶ This period has been covered most recently by W. Ensslin and by A. Christensen in *CAH* 12, chapters ii and iv.

⁶⁷ See Hohl, *RE s. v.* "Iulius" (no. 526 = C. Iulius Verus Maximinus) 857.

⁶⁸ Cf. Welles, *loc. cit.* (see note 1), 102, note 71. The phrase *τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁχθαῖς στρατοπέδων* would well describe the command of the *dux*. Herodian expressly refers to certain measures taken by Alexander before his departure (6.7.5): *καταλιπὼν τε*

career is rather obscure, but it is possible that in 232 he was a *praefectus legionis* in Egypt.⁶⁹ In any event one may assume that Maximinus was an *eques* in 234, of a rank therefore proper for a *dux ripae*. If he did hold such an office, however, it could not have been for long, as he was in Germany at the end of Alexander's reign.

The full force of the Persian attack did not come until after the death of Alexander. During the reign of Maximinus and the first few years of Gordian, the East seems to have been neglected, and Mesopotamia was occupied by the Sassanids. Dura was itself directly menaced in 239.⁷⁰ In the spring of 242, however, Gordian and his father-in-law Timesitheus appeared in the East and conducted a counter-offensive in Mesopotamia which was quite successful while Timesitheus was alive. But after his death and the

δύναμιν ὄσῃν φέτο αὐτάρκῃ ῥύεσθαι τὰς Ῥωμαίων δχθας, τὰ τε στρατόπεδα καὶ τὰ φρούρια ἐπιμελέστερον τειχίσας καὶ πληρώσας ἕκαστα τοῦ ὠρισμένου στρατοῦ, αὐτὸς ἐς Γερμανοὺς ἠπέλγετο ἅμα τῷ λοιπῷ πλήθει. In addition to this there are other passages in which Herodian seems to use *στρατόπεδα* as meaning *castra* or *castella* rather than *legiones*. "Οχθαί certainly has the same force as *ripa*, a *limes* marked by a river. Cf. 1.6.8: διανείμας (ὁ Κόμοδος) οἷς ἔδοκίμασε τῆς δχθης τοῦ Ἰστροῦ τὴν πρόνοιαν προστάξας τε αὐτοῖς ἀνέχειν τὰς τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπιδρομὰς κτλ.; 2.2.8: εὐφρανεῖ τε ἡ τοῦδε (τοῦ Περτινακὸς) ἀρχὴ οὐχ ὑμᾶς μόνον τοὺς ἐνταῦθα δορυφοροῦντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς δχθαις τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς ὄροις τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς ἰδρυμένους; 6.2.1: οὐχ ἡσυχάζει (ὁ Ἄρταξάρης) οὐδ' ἐντὸς Τίγριδος ποταμοῦ μένει, ἀλλὰ τὰς δχθας ὑπερβαίνων καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς ὄρους Μεσοποταμίαν τε κατατρέχει καὶ Σύροις ἀπειλεῖ; 5.3.9: ἐγειντλίαζε δὲ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ τότε μέγιστον στρατόπεδον, δ τῆς Φοινίκης προήσπιζεν (the camp of the *legio III Gallica*); 6.4.7: τινα τῶν στρατοπέδων μετέστησεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐς ἕτερα χωρία, ἐπιτηδειώτερα δοκοῦντα εἶναι πρὸς τὸ κωλύειν τὰς τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπιδρομὰς; 6.2.5: τὰ ἐπικείμενα στρατόπεδα ταῖς δχθαις τῶν ποταμῶν προασπίζοντά τε τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς ἐπολιόρκει (ὁ βάρβαρος).

⁶⁹ So Hohl, *RE* 10.856–7; but see Ritterling, *ibid.* 12.1491. Ensslin (*CAH* 12.72) accepts both the supplement of *PPar* 69 made by Wilcken, on which this possibility is based, and his governorship of Mesopotamia. See Wilcken in *Ph* 53 (1894) 95; and his *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* 1.2 (Chrestomathie) no. 41, col. III.14.

⁷⁰ As is shown by a graffito from the House of Nebuchelus dated approximately April 20, 239: ἐτους νθ' μηνὸς Ξανδικοῦ λ' κατέβη ἐφ' ὑμῶν Πέρσης. See C. B. Welles in *Fourth Dura Report* (see note 7) 112–4, and Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos* (see note 1) 27. One may perhaps connect with the same inroad the fact, revealed by a comparison of the two *acta diurna* (*Dura Papyrus* 3 and 9) that on May 31, 239, the strength of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* was only 781 while at one time in the reign of Severus Alexander it had been 914. The number of officers, *ord(inarii)* or *ord(inati)* and *duplicarii*, is also correspondingly smaller. In the *acta diurna* of 239, moreover, the cohort is commanded not by a tribune but by a *praepositus*, a legionary centurion of whose name only the cognomen Avitus is preserved. It is possible that this circumstance is to be connected with the funerary inscription of Iulius Terentius, the tribune appearing in one of the frescoes from the Temple of the Palmyrene Gods. See the article of C. B. Welles cited in note 1.

murder of the young Emperor, Philip hastened to make a settlement with the enemy and soon thereafter departed for the West. It would have been a suitable moment for the creation of the office of *dux ripae*. Affairs were comparatively quiet and permitted a reorganization of the system of defense. At the same time it was obvious that difficulties would arise again, and the prudent course was to take such measures as might best meet any emergency. Licinius Pacatianus then was quite possibly appointed the first *dux* by Philip in A.D. 245. But although a date either at the end of the reign of Severus Alexander or at the beginning of that of Philip seems most suitable, there is no real evidence for saying more than that the *ducatus* was probably established sometime during the fifteen years ending with 245. The office can hardly have survived the capture and destruction of Dura, which took place in 256 or shortly thereafter, and the permanent loss to Rome of this section of the Euphrates.⁷¹

After a rather long and involved discussion, it may be useful to summarize the more important conclusions. The *dux ripae*, so far as is known at present, was the first of the *duces* to have a regular command and a permanent office. Like the *dux* under Diocletian he was an equestrian commander of garrison troops along a heavily fortified frontier. On the other hand, he was a subordinate of the legate of Syria and commanded only a part of the troops in the province. In some ways the Dura officer resembles earlier *praefecti* more than the later *duces*. The *ripa* under his command probably consisted of that part of Syria Coele which lay below the Chabur, possibly with an additional stretch of territory to the North. His office was created, by 245 at the latest, to meet the Persian menace and presumably passed out of existence at the time of the capture of Dura.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Two inscriptions of interest here have recently been found in the agora of Palmyra.⁷² Both contain the *cursus honorum* of a

⁷¹ A brief statement of what is known concerning the siege and fall of Dura will be found in Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos* (see note 1) 29-30, 141, note 16.

⁷² My knowledge of the inscriptions is based on a letter of M. H. Seyrig to Professor Rostovtzeff. M. Seyrig has kindly given me permission to make use of his transcriptions of the texts. The last four lines of one of them were already known and appear in CIS 2.3962. A photograph of a squeeze of the part of the inscription which was published in the *Corpus* will be found in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* 10 (1905) pl. X.

certain Celsticus, who had been a centurion in three legions: *III Gallica*, *IIII Scythica*, and *VI Ferrata*, a *curator* (a lacuna follows), *curator ripae superioris et inferioris*, and the commander of the *cohors I Sebastena* and of another cohort.

The important point for the present discussion of course is the fact that the officer had been *curator ripae superioris et inferioris*, at what period we do not know. The question which naturally arises is whether or not the office of the *curator* had any connection with that of the *dux*. I see little to indicate that it had. The fact that *ripa* appears in both of their titles means no more than that the sphere of activity of both lay along the Euphrates.⁷³ It does not imply in the least that their duties were similar.⁷⁴ It will be noted further that the office of *curator ripae* was held before that of *praefectus cohortis*, a fact which indicates its relative importance.

Curator was not an uncommon title in either the civil or the military administration. The only officer so designated, however, who could probably be considered here is the *curator annonae* attached to large expeditionary forces.⁷⁵ In particular I may cite the ἐπιμελητῆς εὐθηνίας ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ Παρθικῷ τῆς ὁχθῆς τοῦ Εὐφράτου.⁷⁶ But it is somewhat difficult to accept this interpretation of Celsticus' office since there is no reference either to an *expeditio* or to *annona*. Perhaps *curator* was used rather loosely as equivalent to *procurator*, and we should think of the *ripa* here as meaning a fiscal district and customs border.⁷⁷ However, one would rather expect a military office.

The phrase *ripa inferior et superior* is very interesting. Where the division was we can only guess. Our uncertainty is increased by the fact that the date of the inscription is unknown.⁷⁸

⁷³ Cf. above, note 41.

⁷⁴ The two titles indicate offices of an entirely different kind. For the various *curatores* see E. Kornemann, *RE* s. v. "Curator." Celsticus, moreover, had not yet held even the command of a cohort when he was made *curator*.

⁷⁵ See the articles of von Premerstein and van Berchem to which I refer in note 41.

⁷⁶ *Ann. épig.* 1911, no. 161. See note 41.

⁷⁷ See above, note 35. Cf. *ILS* 1403: *proc(urator) Aug(ustorum) (duorum) ad ripam Baetis* (Seville, A.D. 161-9).

⁷⁸ I have assumed that the *ripa* was that of the Euphrates. This is not explicitly stated (at least in the extant portions of the inscriptions), but it is a fair deduction since the text was found at Palmyra and the other offices held by Celsticus were all in Syria or Palestine.